CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Nos. 1, 2 & 3 APRIL, MAY, JUNE Vol. XXXVI

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Primate and Home Reunion.

The visit of the Archbishop of Canterbury on March 27 to the Jubilee celebrations of the Free Church Federal Council in order to offer it the congratulations of the Church of England was an act as gracious as it was significant. But especially noteworthy was the speech he delivered on that occasion. We cite the *Times* report of March 28:

> The Primate 'invited the leaders of the Free Churches to consider whether they wished to revive the question of reunion as a vital issue, so that any proposals they might desire to make could be discussed at the next Lambeth Conference, in 1948.
>
> "Reunion, when it comes, if by God's grace it does, will be reunion of the Church of England," he added. "It will not be reunion with the Church by you. I want you to weigh that phrase. It will not be reunion with the Church of England; it will be reunion of the Church of England, for you and I were in origin the Church of England in this country. When we come together we become again the Church of England. But now you would come into it with the traditions which you have grown in the period of dislocation, with your own customs, your own methods, and your own style of pulpit oratory. You have also your own hymn tunes and other things that matter in your daily life.
>
> "Will all these things have to disappear in a reunited Church? I should say heaven forbid. Should the Free Churches lose all power of self-direction and identity with the past? Heaven forbid. I look forward to a time when the Church of England, having been reunited, the Methodists, Congregationalists, the Baptists, and the Presbyterians will, within that reunited Church, still function with an identity of their own much as the different orders function within the Roman Catholic Church with an identity of their own."

V.36
1946

If these words mean what they seem to mean—and there is no reason to believe that they do not—then the Primate is prepared should the Free Churches be responsive, to attempt to solve the difficult problem of Home Reunion by a new method — a new method created by a new basic conception. That new basic conception is that the members of the great Free Church denominations in this country are members of the Church of England and are also those Christians in this country who definitely describe themselves as such. The Home Reunion problem therefore is not to reconcile outsiders with insiders, but to reconcile insiders with each other.

Frederick Denison Maurice maintained that there are three Divine Societies in which every Englishman should strive to realize his privileges and duties—the Family, the Nation and the Church. Our Primate, like our English Reformers (of whose doctrine the judicious Hooker in his *Ecclesiastical Polity* is the soundest exponent) equates membership in the Nation with that of membership in the Church. This inspiring and practical conception of a national Church is not opposed to the ideal of One Catholic Church. On the contrary, it offers the best method because the most practical and promising method of realizing this ideal, namely, by the federation of national churches in One Universal Christian Church, which has great advantages over a Universal Church consisting merely of an aggregation of sectarian denominations or a Universal Church secured by an ecclesiastical imperialism dominated by a totalitarian dictator.

The recognition that the One Catholic Church can and ought to be realized ultimately by a Federation of national churches based on their inter-communion, and not by a unity secured by an aggregation of denominationalists or by a universal empire ruled by an ecclesiastical autocrat, is basic for a sound reunion policy. We feel deep thankfulness that our Primate has taken his stand on that basis.

In recent years there has been in English Church circles a growing recognition of the urgent need for intercommunion with the Orthodox Churches. These Churches are national. Therefore the national character of the Church of England, far from being a hindrance to such desirable intercommunion with the Orthodox Churches of Russia, Greece, Rumania, etc., should constitute the most important factor in the advancement of our intercommunion policy in this sphere.

Another basic principle in the policy of the reunion of the Church of England is that it must *begin* with intercommunion. Such a policy of intercommunion demands the liberation of the

great Sacraments of the Christian Religion from Sacerdotalism. In the case of Baptism, the primal sacrament of the Christian Religion, this liberation is complete. Valid Baptism does not demand a bishop or a priest or a deacon to administer it, although it may be very desirable that normally they should administer this sacrament—but we know that Baptism can be validly administered not only by a layman but by a woman, and the ministrants of such valid Baptism may even be schismatics.

In the case, however, of the Holy Communion or Eucharist this sacrament has in many Christian denominations been regarded as invalid, not simply irregular, if administered by a man who has not been episcopally ordained. In order to secure the reunion of the Church of England we must be prepared to regard as valid celebrations of the Holy Communion at which the sacrament is administered by a minister who has not received episcopal ordination, nor indeed any ordination at all, but whose ministerial right to celebrate the sacrament is expressed by the acceptance of his office by the Christian congregation which assists at the sacrament which he celebrates. This we believe to be fundamentally the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England, which asserts in Article XXVI that the validity of a sacrament depends not upon those who administer it but on its being in accordance with Christ's institution. This principle was certainly implicity, if not explicitly, affirmed by the great Lambeth Conference declaration of 1920—the unflinching acceptance of these two basic principles:

1. That national churches constitute rightful units in the One Catholic Church of Christ; and
2. That the two great sacraments of the Gospel, Baptism and the Holy Communion, are valid because ministered in accordance with Christ's Institution (as recorded in the Gospels) and not on account of the status of the ministers by whom these sacraments are administered.

The acceptance of this principle does not of course demand that the Church of England must abandon the ordination and consecration of her Episcopal and Apostolic Ministry, but that she must be prepared, as we believe she essentially is prepared, to recognize the validity of many other types of Christian ministries and to recognize the sacraments as valid when rightly administered by them.

Standing firm on these two basic principles, we have every hope that the Primate's large-hearted invitation to the Free Churches to co-operate with him in securing the Reunion of the Church of England will be ultimately crowned by success.

336795

COMPULSORY CHURCH PARADES.

On March 29 in the House of Commons, the Secretary o State for War announced that compulsory Army Church Parade would be cancelled or modified.

The agitation against compulsory church parades is of lon standing. Mr. Ernest Thurtle, M.P., cites T. E. Lawrence as thei opponent and writes in his recently published *Time's Winge Chariot*:

> 'Lawrence would have liked to see compulsory Church Parade abolished, and he sent me the following amusing advice on the bes method of achieving the desired end: "To achieve it you must procee administratively. The House publicly renders such reforms impossible Lobby the Archbishop of Canterbury. Persuade him to suggest it to th P.M. See that the change is put on the grounds of true religion. Per suade the P.M. to whisper it to the S. of S. for War. Then ask you question . . . and the S. of S. with a pleased smirk says: 'The matte has been the subject of ripe consideration in my Department, and I a glad to say that the Chaplain-General has worked out a scheme (fo putting into force immediately) which will meet the changed condition of our time in the matter of religious observance.' Always get it settle before you speak to two ears at once"' (p. 106).

It is generally agreed to-day, whether by religious or irreligiou people, that compulsory attendance by adults at religious service ought to be abolished. No valid case can be made out against th conclusion. What has survived in the Army was at one time th rule for the whole community. Every adult male had to atten Divine Worship in his parish church on Sunday or else pay a fin which went not into the parson's pocket but into the parish poo box. This practice seems to have been generally accepted as rig and proper except by Romish recusants and Quakers. The Pur tans were as rigorous in practising it as were their ecclesiastic opponents. Indeed the Quakers in New England complained th the Puritan rigour in the matter was greater than that of the bisho in England who fined them only one shilling if they went not church on Sunday, whereas the Puritans in New England did fi them five shillings.

There is now no place within the British Empire where co pulsory attendance at Divine Worship prevails save in H.M Services, definitely religious institutions, and our public schoo where compulsory chapels go hand in hand with compulsory at letics as part of the educational curriculum.

Those who have the religious welfare of our nation at hea seem to be increasingly agreed that what religion most needs not to be made compulsory but to be made attractive and int

igible. It has been discovered by our chaplains that what is known is the padre's hour is much more popular than the church parade, nd that to encourage voluntary gatherings of the former kind for urposes of religious education and devotion is the right method f securing the development of religious influence in our army.

It would be a great mistake, however, when abolishing compulsory attendance at church parades to make this a step towards bolishing official public services altogether. On notable occasions when conducted by competent chaplains they can have real moral nd spiritual value.

A practical but perhaps not a popular point of view was put orward in a letter to the *Times* of April 3.

> SIR,—I suggest that 'compulsory church parade' is a highly misleading term. The Army recruit who declares himself a pagan, an agnostic, an atheist, etc., cannot be required to attend church parades; the man who professes loyalty to one branch or another of the Church cannot be surprised when the authorities take that profession seriously and insist that he should make it good by attendance at divine worship. Neither the Army nor the Church is to be blamed that so many recruits put themselves down as, *e.g.*, 'C. of E.' when in fact they have no attachment to a religious body. In illustration of this argument I would point out that in the nonconformist groups, with a lower proportion of merely nominal adherents, there is relatively little resentment at church parades. What is required is not the abolition of church parade so much as increased realism in the recruits' declarations as to their Church allegiance.
>
> I would also point out, from a wide war-time experience as an officiating chaplain, that what is objected to by most of those who resent church parade is the parade rather than the church service. I have often had to conduct worship with a congregation of troops who have been put in a bad temper, long before they have reached church, by an officer who regards the worship of God as an opportunity to display the smartness of his unit to all and sundry. That is the first value of the padre's hour as I have seen it; it does not entail 'spit and polish,' nor a half-hour of marching at attention. But here again there is an obvious remedy, without abolishing what can be a very profitable institution.
>
> I am, Sir, yours faithfully,
>
> EDWIN WHITE, Officiating Chaplain to the Forces.
>
> Primrose Hill Congregational Church, Northampton. April 1.

In making reforms and modifications it is worth noting that lthough unpopular in the Army, church parades are popular in he Navy. Are sailors more religious than soldiers, or is it that the ethods and conditions of the naval services are more convenient nd congenial? A conference of naval chaplains and army chapins might secure some useful conclusions.

WHEN THE CHURCH SAYS 'NO.'

Dr. Kirk, the Bishop of Oxford, in the *Oxford Diocesan Maga zine* (April, 1946) in an article entitled 'When the Church say "No,"' deals with the unpopularity incurred by the ecclesiastica authorities when they attempt to discipline the laity. It is an ol story, but it has a moral and one which disciplinary-minded cleric would do well to take to heart. Since the consecration of Arch bishop Parker the Church of England has had only one thorough going church disciplinarian, and he was Archbishop Laud. H adopted and carried through with relentless vigour the policy c 'Thorough.' This policy of 'Thorough' created a counter-polic of 'root and branch' aimed at the destruction of the Episcopate and Laud paid with his head for his zeal. We all recognize to-da how great Laud's virtues were—his whole-hearted loyalty to th Church of England (as he understood it), his munificent patronag of sound learning, his generous charity to the poor and humble his selfless and untiring zeal in the cause of religion; but, becaus he failed to understand the temper of the laity, his work, as a ecclesiastical statesman, proved to be a dismal failure and ver nearly brought about the extinction of the English episcopate an the complete suppression of the Church of England.

The English laity definitely refuse to be disciplined by th English clergy. They recognize the right of the English bishop to discipline the clergy provided this be done in accordance wit the laws of the Church and Realm. But the attempt of the clerg to exercise discipline over the laity always rouses deep resentmen Dr. Kirk himself seems to have been surprised at the indignatio aroused in his own diocese by these well-intentioned endeavour He writes :

> 'What surprises me is the degree of shocked resentment, the sense deep and embittered grievance manifested. . . . A very remarkable i stance of this came to my notice a few months ago. It arises out another disciplinary rubric of the Prayer Book. One who was beyon question "an open and notorious evil liver, so that the congregation b thereby offended" had the temerity to present himself at a celebration the Holy Communion in his parish church on one of the great festival There was no question as to the facts: the man openly paraded his ev manner of life in the village, and made a boast of his defiance of the law of God. On the occasion in question, as he entered the church, a strong minded churchwarden took him by the arm, and quietly but firmly l him outside again, debarring him from entrance throughout the duratio of the service. The churchwarden's action met with universal approva but the offender was not satisfied until he had lodged a complaint with th bishop of the diocese, and in a painful interview (in which the bishop e pressed his full support of the churchwarden) insisted that as a confirme Anglican he had an inalienable right to the Holy Communion, whatev

manner of life he chose to lead. He maintained with passionate emphasis that as there were "thousands as bad as himself" it was rank hypocrisy and unfair discrimination to exclude him from a privilege of which other parishioners could avail themselves freely and without scrutiny. That he had any genuinely religious desire for the sacrament may well be doubted. His dominant motive was no doubt a desire either to flout ecclesiastical authority, or else to secure by fair means or foul a kind of public exoneration for his sins. But of his intense indignation when the bishop ratified the churchwarden's action there could be no question.'

The incident recorded is a most painful one. In view of what Dr. Kirk writes it must be assumed that the parishioner was justly deprived of the sacrament, but it may be questioned whether the churchwarden was within his rights in acting as he did unless the parishioner was guilty of 'brawling in church,' for which no evidence is adduced by the Bishop. It is the painful duty of the officiating priest to refuse the sacrament to a scandalous parishioner, but we seriously doubt whether any churchwarden has the right to exclude from entering the church one who desires to enter it at the time of the celebration of the sacrament. As we read the Bishop's account, it would seem that the parishioner's grievance was primarily with the churchwarden.

Other cases of indiscipline to which Dr. Kirk refers are concerned with the endeavours of divorced persons to secure the Church's solemnization of a second marriage while the divorced partner is still living. In a number of these cases the religious laity are in acute disagreement with the clergy. Many of the laity feel that the 'innocent party' ought to have the right to be remarried in church and that a grave injustice is done when this is refused. They are well aware that two citations of Christ's teaching (*Mt.* v, 32, and xix, 9) support their contention and that the practice of various branches of the Church sanctions it. These laity, as a body, are as desirous of maintaining the ideal of monogamous marriage in this country as are the clergy, but they are in acute disagreement with the clergy as to the best method of securing this. The laity are of opinion that in certain cases the present method, by which the Church enforces its ideal, sins against justice, wisdom and humanity and is primarily based on a crude legalist and literalist enforcement of some of Christ's occasional utterances but is not really in accordance with Christ's spirit. The result of this cleavage between clergy and laity is detrimental to public morality, and there is urgent need for the Church authorities to reconsider their practice.

Other cases of indiscipline treated by Dr. Kirk refer to the 'indiscriminate baptism' of infants. He writes:

> 'The Prayer Book baptismal office contemplates throughout that the home environment of the child to be baptized is sufficiently spiritual to ensure that it will be trained in the practice and doctrine of the Church of England; the insistence upon the requirement of godparents provides an additional safeguard. But cases occur in which it is virtually certain that parents intend to send (or take) the children for their religious upbringing not to the parish church but to some sectarian conventicle (usually a completely freelance affair, without affiliation to any of the historic denominations) which is maintaining a continuous guerilla warfare against the Church. Surely, it is urged, the parish priest would only be acting in legitimate defence of the sacrament if he refused to administer baptism in such unsatisfactory circumstances? Those who take this view not unnaturally require the parents to give a clear undertaking that the child shall in due course receive such instruction in Church principles as is provided in the parish; in default of such a promise, and in view of the fact that the parents themselves, or the officials of the sect to which they adhere, are free to baptise, they refuse baptism in the church. For my own part, I believe they are doing Christianity a real service in their insistence upon the acceptance of these conditions by the parents, though I cannot say how the matter would be regarded by the Courts if it ever came into legal cognizance.'

As we understand it, the parish priest has no legal right to refuse baptism to any parishioner provided the rubrics of the Baptismal Service are complied with. The parish priest is not justified in refusing to baptize an infant because its parents are Dissenters and attend dissenting conventicles and may quite possibly bring up the infant to follow their example.

The parish priest will not only be acting illegally in refusing baptism in such a case, but he will also be acting unwisely and uncharitably. The judicious Christian pastor will welcome the contact with the dissenting family of parishioners which has been initiated by the opportunity of baptizing their infant. This contact secured, he will do his best to develop it, and that so effectively that some years later he will have the opportunity of preparing the baptized child for Confirmation. Indeed through the contact with the baptized infant he may even be enabled to win the dissenting parents to attendance at their parish church.

It is hard to imagine, especially in a country parish, the harm that could be done if the parish priest acted in the way which the Bishop is charitably disposed to condone if not to encourage. Not the least consideration which seems to have been ignored in this matter is that baptism is not the sacrament of the Church of England and therefore only admits into the Church of England, but baptism is the sacrament of the Church of God, and therefore admits the baptized into that greater fellowship.

DIE WELTGESCHICHTE IST DAS WELTGERICHT.

Under the title 'Historical Change' Sir Cyril Norwood discusses in the *Fortnightly* (April, 1946) whither, amid all the changes and chances of this mortal life, humanity is being carried. The theme of Sir Cyril's article has been prompted by reading Mr. Lewis Einstein's recently published volume *Historical Change*, which deals acutely with the secondary causes in human history but does not connect them with a First Great Cause. If asked why he does not do this, Mr. Einstein would probably reply that he is satisfied to be a genetic historian but that he is not competent to compose a philosophy of history.

It was, as Dr. Norwood points out, the failure to discover any teleology in human history which was the final verdict of that most readable historian, H. A. L. Fisher. He summed up his conclusion thus :

> 'Men wiser and more learned than I have discerned in history a plot, a rhythm, a predetermined pattern. These harmonies are concealed from me.'

Dr. Norwood, however, as an educationist, is not satisfied to leave the matter there. He views human history as 'a gigantic drama,' not as

> '. . . a tale
> Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury
> Signifying nothing.'

Deep down, human nature cannot be satisfied with the verdict of *Ecclesiastes*, 'Vanity of vanities, all is vanity.'

If our historians cannot provide us with an interpretation of human history more illuminating and more inspiring, educated man is compelled to go to his poets, prophets and philosophers for a 'living faith and a warmer hope.' Of course what the poets, prophets and philosophers give us may only be the product of wishful thinking, to use a favourite phrase of our pseudo psychologists; but it may be, on the other hand, a rational, moral and spiritual interpretation of human history which, as that history advances, will be shewn to be increasingly justified by experience. At this stage of our experience this interpretation of history must be largely a venture of faith.

Dr. Norwood points out that three theories have been held to explain and elucidate the historical process :

> 'The first is the theory that, though there are apparently ups and downs, yet on a survey of the whole field [of human history] it is clear that man is always progressing, man is getting richer, healthier, stronger, learning more and living longer in each generation.'

The second theory views human progress as a product of biological evolution. Herbert Spencer was its prophet and his watchword the 'survival of the fittest.'

> 'He taught, moreover, that development proceeds from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, from the simple to the complex; and ignored the fact that development sometimes proceeded the other way.'

The third theory is thus summarized by Dr. Norwood:

> 'There is a third answer which humanity has given to this question as to the ultimate control of the historical process, and it is that Providence controls and guides, that in the simplest sense we are in the hands of God. . . . It means that the ultimate realities are spiritual, and that, while there is much that we can never hope to explain in this life, yet here on earth we feel, to use the phrase of Keats, that we are in the vale of soul-making. Death is the gate of life, and there is another and a greater drama played elsewhere on a more glorious stage. . . . And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three, and never did the world need this trinity more, faith that God will provide, hope that His kingdom will come on earth, and truth, goodness and beauty be sought and found, charity that shall bind individuals and nations in one. What better inspiration can there be for the United Nations, who without faith and hope and above all charity can do nothing, as indeed they have already shown. Let them so read history, and in this spirit march towards the future, remembering that we are moving in the early dawn of our day, and that there is much about us which we cannot know, and much in front which we cannot as yet descry.'

May we venture to add a practical suggestion from Thomas Carlyle:

> 'That the history of every nation when rightly studied and interpreted will be found to be its own Bible.'

Deaconess Lei and the Chinese Bishops.

Under the stress of war conditions the Bishop of Hong Kong ordained a Chinese deaconess to the priesthood with the approval of the Chinese church people to whom she was appointed to minister. English Anglo-Catholics, however, were scandalized by the Bishop's action; but the Bishop maintained that the English Church authorities had no jurisdiction in the matter and that the decision as to the rightness of his action must be decided by the bishops of his own province. The Church authorities in China, after considering the case, passed the following resolution:

> 'This House regrets the uncanonical action of the Bishop of Hong Kong in ordaining Deaconess Lei to the priesthood; and having understood that Deaconess Lei has already placed in his hands her resignation from the priestly ministry, this House requests the Bishop of Hong Kong to accept it.'

We understand from the *Church Times* that the Bishop of Hong Kong has acted in accordance with this resolution.

In an editorial referring to this episcopal decision the *Church Times* of April 18 affirms that

> 'Churchmen throughout the Anglican Communion will be thankful and relieved at this unequivocal judgment. . . . The confusion and uncertainty created by Bishop Hall's romantic excursion were calculated to do much harm to the Church in China, at a time when it is faced with unprecedented problems and opportunities. The success of the appeal for funds to help the Chinese Church in its post-war task could not fail to be prejudiced, so long as Church people at home were in doubt about the true place of the Church of China in the Anglican Communion.
>
> No more need now be said about this regrettable and astonishing affair. The difficulty has been settled, and settled by the action of the Chinese Church itself, without reliance on outside authority.'

But not, it would seem, without reliance on English financial support.

If this decision is to be taken as absolutely and finally prohibiting the admission of women to priesthood in the Anglican Communion, then there are many English Churchmen both at home and throughout the Empire who do not feel the satisfaction expressed by the *Church Times*. They may hold that women should only be admitted to the priesthood in those localities where their ministry is desired by Church people, but they are convinced that the refusal to regard women as eligible for priesthood in the Christian Church cannot be justified on moral and spiritual grounds, nor can it be justified on New Testament grounds if the words of St. Paul in the *Epistle to the Galatians* are to be given their full force:

> 'Ye are all the sons of God by faith in Jesus Christ. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.
>
> There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female' (*Gal.* iii, 26-28).

Declining Free Churches and Advancing Romanism.

At the Jubilee celebration of the Free Church Council the new Moderator said, as cited in the *Times* of March 28,

> 'that he would like to know why, in the drift from religion, the Free Churches had suffered more than others. The Roman Catholics, if popular report were true, had almost flourished. This was a matter that needed investigation.'

It is no easy matter to investigate, and that not least because we have no official census of religion in this country. This we believe to be largely due to Nonconformist opposition to such a census. In our British Dominions a census of religions is a normal part of the census of population. We hope that at the next census

in 1950 Great Britain will come into line in this matter with the great Dominions.

Attendance at places of public worship is not a secure basis for decision in this matter. The religious services of the B.B.C. are ministering to the religious needs of some millions of our countrymen, who find them more inspiring as well as more easily accessible than the public services of the churches. Of course those who make use of the B.B.C. services and neglect attendance at public worship are in this sphere individualists and do not recognize the social obligation of public worship, which has not only ceased to be popular but has ceased to be regarded as our duty to God and our duty to our neighbour. When you can get everything you need in the religious way by staying at home, why go to church?

In religious denominations, however, like the Roman Catholic, where the strongest emphasis is put upon sacramental worship, the religious individualist is compelled to attend his church, for he cannot receive the sacraments through the B.B.C. Another fact to be recognized is that the Free Churches are essentially free. The Roman Church says to its adherents, 'You must'; the English Church says 'You ought'; but the Free Church says 'You may,' and such freedom is only too likely to be misused where there are so many temptations to misuse it.

There is another cause for the decline of the Free Churches. They were closely associated with political liberalism and in the heyday of its triumph shared its popularity. With its decline the Free Churches have declined. 'Politics in the pulpit' and 'Nonconformist conscience' count for nothing to-day in public life.

The advances in scientific education and the increasing knowledge of the results of Biblical Literary and Historical Criticism have cut at the roots of denominationalist fundamentalism and have seriously weakened the convincing power of their traditional theologies.

> 'Strange that such differences should be
> 'Twixt Tweedledum and Tweedledee.'

Moreover Sectarianism, whether religious or political, is at a discount to-day. Our modern ideologies are internationalist and universalist, and this accords ill with loyalties to 'Little Bethels' and dissenting groups. The Y.M.C.A., the Y.W.C.A. and S.C.M. represent the attractive form of the Free Church spirit to-day and are entirely free from the reproach of sectarianism. Freedom and friendliness are their characteristics.

The experience of Dr. Headlam, the retired Bishop of Gloucester, who claimed that he could staff his diocese with ex-Free

Church ministers, is by no means a unique episcopal experience; and it is not surprising that the Free Church ministry has been led to realize the declining prospects of Free Churchmanship more quickly than the Free Church laity, whose older members are as intensely devoted to their denominationalist traditions and practices as they are suspicious of, and repelled by, the growing Romanization of the National Church.

As for the flourishing appearance of Romanism in this country, we are not convinced that it has a secure basis. Roman Catholicism has secured control of the religious publicity of certain powerful organs of the Press, and the B.B.C. favours us with items of papal proclamations and policies which seem to critical ears to receive more publicity than they deserve. But the prosperity of English Romanism cannot be rightly estimated by its ability to secure publicity of this kind. It has been stated that the number of 'Conversions to Rome' in this country has fallen off by some thousands during the war. This will surprise none who recall the papal support given to Fascism and the cruel persecution of the Ethiopian Church. If there be an increase in the number of adherents to the Papacy in this country it is probably due to the large number of immigrants from the Continent, and especially from Eire. But before sound decisions can be reached we must have a religious census.

The Bishop of Carlisle's Valedictory.

The Valedictory Address delivered by Dr. Herbert Williams, C.H., Bishop of Carlisle, to the Carlisle Diocesan Conference at the conclusion of his episcopate of twenty-five years is significant. 'The Christian religion will need a re-interpretation in our time, just as it had become necessary at other periods of our history' was the theme of the Bishop's address as reported in the *Carlisle Journal* of April 5. The Bishop expanded his theme as follows :

> 'The hardest of all tasks lies in front of our generation — to lead our people to a new revelation of the authority and purpose of Almighty God. I don't think that purpose will ever be accorded them unless first they pass through a period of disillusionment. They are, I think rightly, passing through that period at the present time.
>
> May I say one harder thing. I don't think the Church will accomplish its great task unless the Church also passes through a period of disillusionment. We, who belong to the Church, must understand that the revolution which is affecting our social order must affect also our Church —yes, to the very foundations in which we believe.
>
> We all talk of the necessity of a change in spiritual outlook. But the change in spiritual outlook will certainly find visible expression in the re-interpretation of our creeds, in the re-invigoration to some extent also

> of our formularies of worship. I think we have not yet begun to realise that the change in spiritual outlook for which we are looking must be preceded by a change in religious values.'

In these words the Bishop has expressed a general and growing conviction possessed by the more thoughtful and seriously-minded of English people. Ever since the publication of *Essays and Reviews* in 1860 this has been the expressed opinion of a number of eminent English Churchmen, but the response made by the English clergy to the courageous and prophetic teaching of these scholars and thinkers has been very disappointing. Even to-day the clerical reactionaries far outnumber the progressives. As a consequence, multitudes of English people have not only lost all confidence in the Church's leadership and teaching but also all belief in its national value.

These are hard sayings, but we have no right to despair. The time has certainly come for decision and precision. First things must come first. The temptation of Churches as of individuals to be satisfied with doing small jobs instead of large ones, and soft jobs instead of hard ones, needs much courage and conviction if it is to be overcome.

No doubt Church finance, Church organization and Church administration are always in need of attention, but there are a number of subordinate officials, and not least lay officials, who are competent to deal with these things. The apostles refused to neglect the 'Ministry of the Word' in order to 'serve tables.'

We need a great simplification of Christian doctrine; we need a new, yet very old, presentation of the Christian good news, and that as the ever-present and ever-coming Kingdom of God on earth, and not as a mythical 'plan of salvation' originating with the Fall, reaching its crisis in an expiatory sacrifice for sins, and concluding with an apocalyptic Divine Assize.

The personal, social, political and international salvation of mankind urgently needs this real practical gospel to-day instead of the traditionalist, dogmatic churchianity which is persistently offered and is increasingly ignored. We realize how hard it is for the Church to get down to the bedrock of the Gospel of Jesus and to build on that, especially when there are such disputes among Christians as to what is the bedrock. But until this be done there is no hope of humanity as a race being converted to the Christian Religion as its bond of union and its means of temporal as well as eternal salvation. As Modernists we are heartily in agreement with the Bishop of Carlisle's affirmation:

> 'I still believe, and shall continue to believe, that what lies in the essence of the Christian religion will be discovered to be as true as ever.'

THE SPRING OF CHRISTENDOM *

By the Rev. Ronald Preston, M.A. (Oxon.), B.Sc. (Lond.),
Study Secretary, Student Christian Movement.

A BOOK of seventeen essays, filling some 250 packed pages, and claiming to be the product of nearly a quarter of a century's group thinking on the problems of the Christian faith and the social order, deserves serious consideration from all those who share the authors' concern for a more effective Christian social witness in our time. We must begin our appraisal of their book by indicating the background of their thought.

I.

'Christ's blood on Calvary the spring of Christendom,' a quotation from *Piers Plowman* printed opposite the title page, indicates the double reference of the 'Christendom' group. They are an informal association of High Church Anglicans who split from the old Church Socialist League in 1923. That League had had a very chequered history. Founded in 1906 to express dissatisfaction with the political vagueness and ineffectiveness of what was left of the impetus given to Anglican social witness in the nineteenth century by men like F. D. Maurice and Bishop Westcott, it had a disturbed career from the beginning. Both its theological foundations and the type of socialism it favoured were uncertain, and there were several splits in it which need not concern us now. (The story was told in more detail in a previous article of mine in this journal, *A Century of Anglican Social Thought*, March 1943.) The Anglo-Catholics who left the C.S.L. in 1923 formed the League of the Kingdom of God. Canon Widdrington, in an epilogue to this book, tells something of its history. They left because they disliked Christians accepting their social programme from the Labour Party and similar left-wing secular groups, and were convinced that the Christian must free himself from assumptions and programmes built upon non-Christian foundations. To quote another of the essayists, Canon Hudson,

> 'Christian ethics cannot be simply "applied" in conditions which issue from a repudiation of Christian ideas as to the purposes of common life. When the Christian moralist is content to work within the limitations imposed by the unexamined ends of secular society, he is likely to be content either with the sentimental Utopianism of the "Social Gospel" or with the pietistic ineptitudes of Buchmanism.'

* *Prospect for Christendom*, Essays in Catholic Social Reconstruction, edited by Maurice B. Reckitt. (Faber & Faber, London, 1945; 12/6 net.)

Consequently they disentangled themselves from politics and focussed their minds and energies on the recovery and re-statement of the idea of *Christendom*, 'the restoration of the idea of the Kingdom of God as a regulative principle of human living for man and for society,' and to continue this quotation from the Editor's introduction, 'sought rather in Christian doctrine and tradition than in the ethical idealism of the age, the sanction and the clue for the recovery of a Christian sociology.' The enquiry has been pursued in a series of Summer Schools of Christian Sociology at Oxford, in the pages of a quarterly journal, *Christendom*—(not to be confused with the American journal of that name)—and now in this book. It has meant a loss of contacts with the workers and their organizations, as Canon Widdrington admits, and he thinks that the translation of the ideas of this book into the language of the average man is an immediate duty if the 'retreat to the mountains' is to be justified.

Unfortunately the group got off on the wrong foot from the beginning. They were so anxious not to say what the ordinary Labour man was saying that they forgot that people starting from a very different religious or philosophical background *may* agree on the same immediate programme. For the economic and political judgement which underlies the support of the Labour Party programme depends to a considerable extent, in the end, on technical information which is common to Christian and non-Christian alike. This was obscured in the days of the C.S.L. by its tendency to treat Socialism as the putting into practice of the Christian *Gospel*. The group was quite right to object to this confusion of a particular political programme with the eternal gospel, but it was wrong to make a fetish of going for something different, and wrong to try to extract from the Christian faith more *detailed* social guidance than it can rightly be asked to provide. This we shall illustrate below. For the moment let us note that the result of more than twenty years' retreat to the mountains is a book which, despite excellent qualities, has made irrelevance a virtue, and which in several of the essays *which are most characteristic of the group* is gravely misleading. On the other hand, some of the essays are very good, but their excellence does not depend on the characteristic tenets of the Christendom group.

II.

For not all the sixteen contributors share the same presuppositions. Mr. Noel Davey, for instance, who begins the book with an essay *The Hope of Christendom Authentic*, has been deeply influenced, like his teacher Canon Hoskyns (whose un-

inished commentary on the Fourth Gospel he prepared for publi-cation) by the movement of theology on the continent associated with the name of Karl Barth, and is far more Biblically grounded than any other contributor to the book. All Christian thought springs from the life, death and resurrection of Christ. The whole world at every moment must be claimed for Him, because

> 'God has made it possible for every situation in which we find ourselves to be so fully identified with Christ's death as to be eternally glorified in His resurrection,' yet 'this inescapable condition — identification with Christ's death — warns us that perfection lies beyond death, and therefore beyond our present comprehension.' And again, 'Christ does not conquer the world by withdrawing men from it; still less by abandoning them to it.'

The second essay, by Canon Demant, on *The Idea of a Natural Order*, is a fine and subtle piece of writing, which, however, might well have been more explicitly related to Mr. Davey's preceding one. We must note carefully what he is after. He wants 'a social order in which the conscious leadership would be guided by an understanding of the essential nature of the human being, the term "nature" being used here of what man is in the order of creatures.' He then analyses man's nature in a fashion strongly reminiscent of Reinhold Niebuhr's Gifford Lectures on *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, showing how man is always tempted to exaggerate or even deify a partial aspect — for example, vitality or reason — of his complex nature as a spirit-centred organism. At the same time the natural order of his being, his real nature, constantly tugs him back from the extreme towards the norm. The fact that he contradicts his 'real' nature and yet cannot get away from it involves the whole Christian Gospel of the transcendence and immanence of God, of man's fall from his intended state of responsible obedience and worship, and of his redemption by Christ. This Christian understanding of man, built upon the facts of common experience and illuminated by the Christian revelation and integrated into a coherent world view, must express itself in social as in personal life, and constitutes a fundamental basis for all Christian thinking.

III.

So far, so good; and we must be grateful to Canon Demant for setting the Christian understanding of man so firmly in the centre, and showing how it makes sense of the different swingings of the pendulum in human history. But how *precisely* does it bear on the social problems of the day? Here the trouble starts. How far does the 'natural law' take us, and what can we validly deduce from it? Many of the contributors want to include much more

under the term than the Christian doctrine of man. It is indeed a most confusing concept. Canon Hudson shows himself aware of the difficulty when he remarks that very conflicting accounts are given of the further content of the term. It seems to me that the attempt to extract more detail from it had better be given up; the worst essays in this book are bad because they try to do just that. Canon Demant, however, is not open to precisely this criticism. So far we have cordially agreed with his analysis of man's nature in the order of creation, and if he restricted the term natural law or order to that all would be well, even though the term is confusing. In his last section on 'natural order and social structure,' he arrives at the following *metaphysical* (not physical or moral) precedence: the family first, then cultural activities, political activities third, and economic activities last. There is nothing to quarrel with in this, but it appears to be the kind of conclusion which can be established without any appeal to distinctively Christian assumptions and, indeed, most of Canon Demant's reasoning is of a general type. If this is so, we must be careful that our intellectual tools for reasoning and analysis are adequate. The importance of this point will appear in a moment. Moreover, Mr. Reckitt, in a later essay, takes the lowest in Canon Demant's list, economic activities, and within this works out an hierarchical order, of first agriculture, then industry, commerce and lastly finance. Again, in general terms, this is acceptable. But on the same page we abruptly find this being applied in physical and moral terms to an England treated in isolation, the condemnation of the abandonment of the mediaeval principle of the Just Price and Usury Laws, and the following detailed proposals put forward as a programme:

> 'The essays which follow will suggest or imply that the achievement of a Christian realm will require the rescue of the rural community in defiance of "the City" and the heresies of a predominantly export economy; the protection of small property by legislation directed to restrain monopoly, and steps taken to guarantee to all some form of unconditional income such as alone can underpin the family in a world of forces threatening to disintegrate it; a technique for the assessment of cost which will result in the extrusion of bank-created debt from prices and their calculation on a basis of objective realities; the establishment of social control over finance on such truly scientific principles as will enable a community to buy what it can make and exchange; and the re-alignment of industry on a basis of democratic corporatism combining co-operation for many matters of common interest with flexibility for the units within the producing associations or gilds, and competition in respect of methods of production.'

The root question is — are we allowed to agree or disagree with this programme on scientific and general grounds, or is it claimed to be so connected with Christian doctrine that if we

understood the Faith properly we should inevitably agree with it? As far as I can gather from the essay in which the quoted passage occurs, Mr. Reckitt does not claim that this programme is deducible from the Incarnation, or even from natural law, but that it is derived from the social theories and institutions of the Middle Ages. But if we are to apply them to our situation to-day we must have the requisite tools to analyze where we are and the inadequacy of the proposed remedy. Where are those tools to come from? One would have thought from the sciences whose business it is to study the social phenomena largely covered by the programme; that is to say, the social sciences, and in particular economics. All of these have developed immensely since the Middle Ages, when indeed they hardly existed. In this book, however, on almost every occasion when economists are mentioned, they are called 'heathen' or 'godless' and their work dismissed with contempt. What is the result? Whenever most of the essayists, even otherwise sensible ones, mention finance, they immediately lose their heads and say something silly. They all appear to work on an erroneous assumption about an inevitable chronic deficiency of purchasing power in the modern economic system, and on an equally wrong idea of the function of international trade as a means of dumping on other countries otherwise unsaleable goods to alleviate the effects of this alleged deficiency in the home market. The climax comes with Mr. D. G. Peck's essay on *The Function of Finance*, which consists of twenty-two pages of what the uninstructed reader would imagine to be authentic economic analysis. And yet it is a topsy-turvy economics of Bedlam, with here and there a lucid gleam which one can tell by the context is by accident, not design.

I have written, of course, on the assumption that economics is a valid science. This, the writers of these essays would deny. But on what grounds? None of them shows the slightest sign of ever having studied modern economics seriously. If they were out to disprove it from within they would deserve our serious attention. But such is not the case. It is difficult to believe that a man who knew nothing of the subject would publish a twenty-two page technical essay on finance, but Mr. D. G. Peck has done it because he will not be bothered to understand what 'masquerades' as economics in our Universities, and therefore has invented one of his own. He gives himself away in many places; I take one instance from page 152, when in the middle of a paragraph he suddenly inserts this sentence: 'Note that it costs three times as much to market and sell a thing as it does to make it'—and then passes on. No one who had had any scientific training in economics

could have written a sentence like that. If he means 'on an average,' he does not say so; if not, the statement is nonsense. The relation of the cost of marketing and selling a product to that of manufacturing it varies enormously — as, for example, between bread and patent medicines. Further, what is there in Christian doctrine which gives Mr. Peck the technical equipment to attribute our evils to the distressing habits of banks wanting loans repaid? If Mr. Peck rests his conclusions on Christian doctrine he is clearly trying to make the doctrine of divine creation usurp the methodological postulates and legitimate autonomy of economics. But in fact, like other writers of the group, he shows a marked preference for economic 'cranks' because their conclusions fit in better with his preconceived ideas, though he gives us no grounds for regarding his preference as other than perversity.

The same defect is apparent in the treatment of agriculture. Economics is not a normative science, but the important things it can do are twofold. It can help us to understand where we are and the forces at work, which to some extent limit where we can go, and it can also help us to see which choices are compatible with one another, and at what cost. (The simple economic truth that the real cost of an article is the *alternatives foregone* has never occurred to these 'economists.') Mr. McLaughlin, in *Nature and the Rural Man*, advocates maximum (a vague word) food production at home, and he also, though it does not come out in this essay, wants a bigger rural population. Economics can tell him that these aims are incompatible except at the cost of reducing our standard of living to something like that of a Bulgarian peasant. British agriculture can be efficient or large, but not both. There is no treatment of agricultural efficiency in these pages, no consideration of our obligations to the producers of primary food-stuffs overseas, no analysis of the problems of malnutrition and how to meet them, no precise enquiry into the inter-relations of town and country. Shortly after finishing his essay, I had occasion to read a recently published book by C. S. Orwin, the Director of the Agricultural Economics Research Institute of Oxford University, *Problems of the Countryside*, and it was like a breath of fresh air after the stuffiness of this chapter. Mr. McLaughlin talks of an organic view of life and 'a pattern of life given in creation.' When we ask what it is, we are told that it is 'all *revealed* in the process of living in and with nature.' The revelation involves opposition to artifical manures, artificial insemination, and imported foodstuffs. The source of this goes beyond economic ignorance to an attitude to the soil which is explicitly theological. Mr. McLaughlin holds

that salvation applies to things as well as *persons*, for, quoting *Ephesians*,

> 'God is going to gather together in one all *things* in Christ; so that to confine the scope of salvation to the realm of human souls is not merely to arrogate to ourselves a condition of privilege without warrant, but to make nonsense of Divine revelation.'

Christians, therefore, must 'resist all attempts to divorce nature from the operations of grace and to leave it unredeemed and in hostility.' Echoes of St. Paul's passage in *Romans* vii in which 'the whole creation groaneth and travaileth' come to mind, and I confess at once that I have always found difficulty in knowing how much precise metaphysical doctrine to build on St. Paul's almost lyrical use of the familiar apocalyptic imagery. I cannot see how mankind can have duties to *things apart from human purposes*, and in what sense redemption applies to what are not, in a spiritual sense, persons. I have been told that my attitude is anthropocentric, and my attention called to the typical Chinese picture which contains a large mountain, and probably a bridge over a river, and, finally, a little man. But that same little man is worth more than the highest inanimate mountain. The whole conception denies what is certainly an explicit Biblical doctrine, man's lordship over creation under God, and its attitude to nature seems to me to rest upon a 'personification' of nature which borders on the sentimental. There is, of course, a sense in which the nature of inanimate material must be respected, or disaster will ensue. There are some things which simply cannot be done with wood, for instance; it is against its 'nature.' But this is clearly quite a different sense of the word nature, akin to its use in natural science.

IV.

We have dwelt so long on these points because they are in many ways most characteristic of the outlook of the *Christendom* group and most open to criticism. However, it must be stressed that the majority of the essays do not follow any of these lines of thought but depend for their fundamental assumption on the Christian concern for persons, based on that Christian doctrine of man which Canon Demant so ably analysed in the second essay of the book. Mr. E. L. Mascall, writing on family life, gives a clear and vivid analysis, mainly from Maritain, of the Christian understanding of personality as 'the capacity to make free and responsible decisions and the capacity to give oneself in them.' Mr. T. S. Eliot, in an obscure essay in which he does not seem quite clear himself what he wants to say, at least drives home the point that a religion must express itself in a culture. Mr. Philip

Mairet's discussion of a *Civilization of Technics* contains some brilliant writing on the triumph of the technician, and the vulgarisation of science which has been brought about by the weakening of religion. His attitude to technical change is by no means negative; 'such things as efficiency, economy of effort, hygiene, sanitation and a wholesome standard of living are all good, and if we have to work within a social movement that is dedicated to no worse ideals, we should count ourselves rather fortunate.' Mr. T. M. Heron in *Man at Work* also has some wise things to say about the characteristics of the technologist and the machine tender, and writes well on absorption in work as analogous to absorption in prayer, since in both cases a man is giving himself to God. These two essays are the best writing on industry we have had from the *Christendom* group. The late Ruth Kenyon makes two contributions; one (drawing largely on the work of Lewis Mumford) on the town as a place for human beings to live in, where she stresses the importance of local initiative; the other a rather barren discussion of *The Scope and Limits of State Initiative,* in which she takes as her text T. S. Eliot's definition of the political end as

> 'a society in which the natural end of man—virtue and well-being in community—is acknowledged by all, and the supernatural end—beatitude—for those who have eyes to see.'

W. G. Peck (the father of D. G. Peck) writes disappointingly on *Recovery in Politics*; in particular he quite fails to see how close the immediate aims of the secular and Christian humanist may be, or to do justice to the achievements of Western democracy. His last paragraph, however, is good. There are also two essays on nationalism and internationalism. The one by Canon Charles Smyth stresses the positive value of national sovereignty; the other, by Canon Cyril Hudson, is also a plea for taking nationalism seriously, but nevertheless the author envisages the surrender of national control over the armed forces and foreign policy. Canon Smyth always writes vigorously, and although I dislike his Toryism, I can disagree on the political level, since fortunately he does not claim theological grounds for it. But for one footnote he should be pilloried. It does indeed look foolish in the light of last year's Election result to say:

> 'Our Allies (*sic*, the United States) would be well advised to look with suspicion on all attempts to get them bought for minority schemes for the social reconstruction of this country after the termination of hostilities.'

All these essays do not build upon more than the generally accepted Christian doctrine of man, and with the analysis which most of them contain one can agree or disagree without bringing in strictly theological questions. Actually there is a tendency to

stress one side of that doctrine, man's freedom and dignity, rather than his sinfulness. This may be the reason for the inadequate treatment in the book of the problem of power and its responsible use. It may also account for its rather hierarchical tendency. Nothing is said of the oppressive side of feudalism, and the modern democratic social welfare state is most unjustly abused.

V.

Other criticisms can also be made about the general tenor of the book. It contrives to be very inward looking in English, and not even in British terms. No account is taken of the positive and negative significance of the U.S.S.R. Even within English terms little is said about anything in our history since the Reformation. The Free Churches are ignored. And while the authors do, on the whole, come to terms with technological progress, the impression is given that almost every other development in thought and practice since the Middle Ages has been a mistake. Nor is any guidance given as to how to get things done. The concluding essays, by Canon Balmforth on *The Forces Against Us* and by Miss Rosalinde Wilton on *What we may Count Upon*, although interesting, are, once more, general analyses. Clearly the 'retreat to the mountains' has had unfortunate consequences. Not least, as we have noted, the exaggerated fear of echoing current progressive thought. Canon Balmforth says:

> 'In the immediate future the danger will be not so much the unawakened conscience of ordinary Church folk as the bad theology of the impatient enthusiast who wants to "get things done" and, by a wrong identification of Christianity with social aims, turns the Christian faith into a convenient weapon for helping English society along the lines of self-improvement it has marked out for itself.'

There is a warning here which we may do well to heed, but it can be carried to excess. Instead of these undesirable social aims, the *Christendom* group offers us a social programme based on wrong technical analysis and one which, in general, is not relevant to the present scene. Where it is relevant, it is most likely to play into the hands of reactionary groups. We have a Labour Government in power representing a movement whose beginnings (unlike Continental left movements) had many Christian connections, mainly Nonconformist, but which has steadily got more secularized owing to the failure of the Church to appear convincing to the British worker or to the product of State secondary school education. An immense importance attaches to the renewal of Christian elements in the Labour movement, to prevent its predominantly ethical humanism from going bad, and to wean Churchgoers away from a

complacent middle-class outlook which is still too prevalent. All of these questions are side-stepped by the *Christendom* group and their contribution to them is *nil*.

We are not for a moment implying that any Christian is asked to follow the Labour or any other political party without reserve. And this point brings us back, in conclusion, to the Editor's introduction. Once again we get the same note struck when he criticizes the assumption

> 'that in the controversies and alignments which have arisen out of so many centuries of development unguided by Christian doctrine and unrelated to the social conditions of Christendom, Christians can expect to find parties and movements into which they can fling themselves without reserve.'

There is never likely to be any political party of such a kind, nor do most other Christian writers on the social order imply that Christians should expect to find one; political activity is essentially one in which we are called to work on broad lines of agreement with all and sundry who share that agreement as a result of their general analysis of the situation. We must not expect to arrive at distinctively 'Christian' political directives deduced from an illegitimate extension of the concept of natural law, still less to bolster them up by cranky science.

Here lies the real complaint against the book. Mr. Reckitt in his introduction airily says that its writers could write the criticisms that will be made of it in advance, and the answers as well. According to him, these are chiefly two:

> 'If the suggestions are related with any closeness to the conditions of any social structure which can be foreseen, they are denounced as "blue prints." If, abjuring this, they portray a social order in vaguer outline they are dismissed as Utopian.'

This makes it clear that he has not in fact grasped all the criticisms. The most serious are: first, that many of their proposals are not related to any foreseeable social order because their tools for diagnosis are inadequate; second, and allied to it, they attempt to get too much directly out of Christian doctrine, so that there are grounds for calling the vaguer social order they outline not Utopian but undesirable. Mr. Reckitt's cocksureness is not justified. We beg him to consider whether there are not considerations which he has overlooked.

THE POSITION AND PROSPECTS OF LIBERAL CHRISTIANITY

By the Rev. Ralph Gardner, Vicar of Godmanchester.

I APPROACH this subject as a member of the Church of England. But — as will probably be sufficiently obvious — I cannot claim to be a representative Anglican, or even a representative *Liberal* Anglican.

Indeed it would be difficult to find any Anglican, priest or layman, who could be described as, in all points, representative of Anglicanism. For the Church of England is unique among the historic churches of Christendom in its comprehensiveness. Within its borders may be found an extraordinary variety of religious opinion and emphasis lying between two extremes.

At one extreme you find the parish church where the Prayer Book services, the pulpit teaching, and the church furniture present a colourable imitation of what you would find in a Roman Catholic church. At the other extreme you find all the emphasis, in appearance, teaching, and devotion, laid on the Protestant reaction against mediaeval Catholicism. Between these two extremes of Romanizing Catholicism and militant Protestantism may be found High Churchmen and Low Churchmen, Liberal Catholics and Liberal Evangelicals, Moderate, Broad, and Central Churchmen in innumerable shadings, linked together within one institution but differing widely in teaching and outlook.

This strange medley is not the result of a deliberate policy or purpose. Rather it is, like so many other English things, the legacy of events in English history and an illustration of the national genius — or weakness — for compromise. It is a situation which many Anglicans, believing their party view to be the exclusively correct one, deplore; while Christians outside often find it puzzling, repellent, or even a subject for jesting. To Roman Catholics in particular the idea of a Church which does not apparently know its own mind, in which various groups and individuals, within the broadest limits, are laws unto themselves, and where half a dozen accredited priests may give different and even contradictory answers to the same question, is ludicrous and self-condemning.

Our Anglican comprehensiveness, however, is largely a natural growth arising from the fact that the Church of England is the established national Church. The Establishment holds together these apparently incompatible elements, and if the Church were disestablished the more intransigent of those elements would

probably fly off in several directions, while the remainder would become subject to the uniformative control which is so dear to the ecclesiastical type of mind. This Anglican comprehensiveness gives a clue to the meaning of the word 'Liberalism' when applied to religion.

A Liberal Christian is distinguished from a Conservative Christian not so much by the form of his faith — which may vary with different individuals or groups, and even with the same individual or group from time to time — but by his attitude of mind, his line of approach to Christianity. Broadly speaking, the Conservative, the traditionalist, looks to external authority, whether of Church or Bible, to guarantee his religion to him. He tends to conceive of religious truth as being capable of exact verbal definition, much as scientific truth can be accurately defined in words. He inclines to make the dividing line between religious truth and falsehood as narrow as that which divides a correct scientific formula from an incorrect one. He limits the rights and powers of private judgment in religion to the selection of the competent authority, whose teachings he may verify in experience but which he has no right or ability to criticize. Traditionalists may dispute among themselves as to where the external authority is to be found; but their method of approach is broadly the same and based on the same assumptions.

Liberal Christians, on the other hand, accord to external authority evidential and persuasive rather than coercive status. They regard religious truth more in terms of value than in terms of logical reasoning, and definitions of faith as approximations and symbols rather than as scientifically accurate formulae. They treat uniformity of worship and even of formal belief as comparatively unimportant and are at home with the categories of 'more' and 'less' rather than with those of 'true' and 'false.' Their standards of judgment are closer to those of aesthetics than to those of science. They believe moreover that there is within the individual human soul something which is congruous with the ultimate reality of the universe and which can be trusted to lead them, in so far as they are unimpeded by prejudice or preconception, towards the truth. Therefore they are ready to criticize authority if the weight of evidence from all sources impels them to do so, just as they are ready to acknowledge authority when and in so far as it appears to win its case on its own merits.

The traditionalist therefore always finds in Liberalism what Pius X found in Roman Catholic Modernism—'the compendium of all the heresies'; for to his mind it takes away the one key which unlocks the door of religious knowledge. He is never tired

of pointing out the contradictions and inconsistencies into which the Liberals are constantly plunged; because his own mind demands exactness and uniformity precisely where the Liberals regard exactness as irrelevant and uniformity as undesirable. A cynical wit once hit off the three main groups within the Church of England as 'the Low and Lazy, the Broad and Hazy, and the High and Crazy'; and perhaps it was the same cynic who called them 'the Platitudinarians, the Latitudinarians, and the Attitudinarians.' Certainly, to the mind of the traditonalist, the attribution of 'haziness,' of 'latitude' or 'breadth' is not less damaging than the criticisms implied in the other epithets.

It is well to recognize that the charge of 'haziness' applied to Liberalism is not entirely unfounded. To the severely logical mind a 'broad' Christianity is a Christianity which has lost its cutting edge. And if the characteristic vice of the logical, ecclesiastical Christian is intolerance and heresy-hunting, that of the 'broad' Christian is the reduction of religion to the level of arid abstractions. So handled, the Christian faith becomes little more than an academic subject, seldom moving outside the study or the lecture-room. It holds no torch to the eager, inflammable hearts of living men and brings no comfort for their aches and pains.

But the true Liberalism is not just an intellectual attitude, primarily disruptive and criticial.

> 'Religion,' says Bergson, 'is the crystallization, brought about by a scientific process of cooling, of what mysticism has poured, white hot, into the soul of man.'[1]

The great Liberals have always been mystics. They have been chiefly concerned with the task of recovering the glowing reality of which contemporary religious tradition was the clinkered and denatured residue. They had, in more or less degree, an apprehension, an intuition, of reality so vivid, immediate, and compelling that they could neither find words to express it nor yet remain silent about it. In the light of their expanded awareness the noblest theologies appeared as mere adumbrations and symbols of the inexpressible fact. Tradition, authority, historical evidence — for so many the necessary buttresses of religious assurance — were by-passed. They bathed in fresher springs of faith than those which, muddied with human pride and error, trickled through the traditions of their elders.

One can offer no proof of these assertions which would satisfy the merely logical mind. The mystical experience, as William James showed,[2] is absolutely authoritative only over those

[1] *Morality and Religion* (Macmillan, 1935), p. 203.

[2] *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (Longmans Green, 1928), chs. 16 and 17.

individuals who have it; though it never fails to make bright and often confusing marks on events which strongly suggest the presence of some unusual luminant. I am not myself a mystic; but, like James, I find that when I hear or read descriptions of such experiences 'something within me answers the call.' I can only say that I am writing for those who share my innate but unproveable conviction that some people have had — and probably all are potentially capable of having — access to a level of knowledge and reality beyond the reach of the mind as we commonly know and use it. When the mind at its ordinary level gets to work on such experiences it inevitably uses only halting, inadequate, or even misleading language. There have been mystics whose mental equipment has been too weak to carry the strong liquor of mystical experience, and then madness or fanaticism have justified the Church's jibes. Sometimes they have been able, though usually with some restlessness, to fit themselves into the current orthodox framework, and then the dry bones of ecclesiasticism have quivered into life as at a magician's touch — as when the friars set out upon their journeys in the thirteenth century, or when the Curé d'Ars, harping continually on the theme of hell-fire, nevertheless with a sublime inconsistency touched infidel nineteenth-century France with a flame of divine charity. But the greatest mystics have surely been the great Liberals, men of strong and noble intellect, who have had the power to interpret, to themselves and to others capable of receiving it, the meaning and implications of their vision for thought and life. With these the traditionalists have never been happy. The official Church has either lost or excommunicated many more of them than it has retained — though in some cases it has canonized them when they were safely dead and could no longer be troublesome. The ecclesiastical institution instinctively fears those who deal in the raw material from which it has manufactured, through complex processes and with grievous adulteration, creed and system; but it needs them too, and between fear and need it is in a quandary. I am proud to think that the Church of England — unique among the historic churches — has housed not a few mystic-minded Liberals and has on the whole been kind to them.

* * * * * *

Having thus indicated the sense in which I use the word 'Liberal,' with no attempt to justify the assumptions behind it, let us take a glance at the recent movements of Liberalism within the Christian Church, so that we may make some estimate of the present situation and the prospect of the future.

Liberal Protestantism.

In Germany and England the attempt to bring the historic religion into accord with the intellectual climate of the late nineteenth century resulted in the emergence of what has been called Liberal Protestantism. Its title to the name of 'Protestantism' in any historic sense is slight, because it either threw over completely, or reduced to the palest of shadows, the characteristic doctrines of the Reformation. Its main work was the setting forth of a Jesus from whom all miraculous, mysterious, and transcendental elements had been removed, as being accretions due to the lively and superstitious imaginations of men. Liberal Protestants took the view that Christianity was a rolling stone which had gathered so much moss that its original shape and substance were almost completely hidden from view. When the moss was scraped off, by a judicious application of modern scientific ideas and the results of Biblical criticism, there was found, not the Christ of the stained-glass window or the elaborately ornamented ikon, but a humble Jewish peasant who was a supreme religious genius; who had taught sublime ethical truths with unexampled charm and lucidity; who had suffered martyrdom; and whose ideas, germinating in His followers, had somehow permeated a large part of the human race through their inherent vitality. In the course of nineteen centuries those ideas had been overloaded with a vast superstructure of man-made dogma and tradition, so that the purity of the original teaching had been gravely impaired.

The task of Liberal Protestantism, it was believed, was to strip away the superstitious and erroneous additions and lay bare again the original Gospel; which turned out to be—in the words of Dr. Micklem—a system of 'general propositions, illustrated, but not constituted, by historical events.'[3] The ecclesiastical Christ was replaced by the human Jesus, who was curiously like the picturesque reflection of a late nineteenth-century humanist. The Gospel of Divine Intervention and Redemption was replaced by a Gospel of personal and social self-improvement. The vivid picture of God as the heavenly Father was replaced, as someone has said, by 'a kind of oblong blur.'

This remarkable change was effected by the method of reading contemporary ideas into the remote past and rejecting everything in Scripture and tradition which conflicted with the fashionable scientific outlook and optimism. Those who undertook this work believed that they were giving Christianity, overloaded with the

[3] From a University sermon preached in Great St. Mary's, Cambridge, April 29th, 1945. Printed in 'The Cambridge Review,' May 5th, 1945, under the title *The Nature of Religious Truth*.

weight of its history, the chance to become young and vigorous again. The finer spirits among them — scholars like Harnack and Sabatier, a few outstanding preachers like R. J. Campbell at the City Temple — secured a good deal of public attention. But once the glamour of unorthodoxy had worn off the Liberal Protestant Gospel showed no more power to attract the masses than the ecclesiastical display of dogma. The drift from organized religion continued, and the new version of Christianity, like the older versions, was preached to dwindling congregations.

For Liberal Protestantism was in fact not so much the result of scientific investigation as the religious reflection of a fashionable mental attitude. In a few years human control over the forces of nature had increased so enormously that by the turn of the century it seemed to the average observer that nothing could greatly delay the coming of 'the one far-off divine event' to which the whole creation had been moving for so long. True, there were manifest evils and problems to be dealt with, but the dazzlingly rapid progress of man in mastering new engineering and manufacturing techniques made everything seem dead easy. The human race was fast emerging from the state of a sick patient needing a doctor — it had taken its own case in hand. Mankind was on its feet — if a religion was needed at all, it was for encouragement rather than for any drastic healing.

But already the inner strains and stresses which culminated in the first World War were producing ominous noises; and in the course of a few years the whole mental climate changed. The conditions for which the Liberal Protestant Gospel had been devised altered beyond recognition. In place of a prevailing self-confidence came a general sense of inadequacy, doubt, and fear. The hope that human science would make man the master of his fate gave way to the fear that it would become the instrument of his destruction. In such an atmosphere the unmysterious human Jesus of Liberal Protestantism, never a really solid figure, melted away to a shadow. The race, after a few decades of exciting exploration, was back in bed again, needing not a friendly pat of encouragement, but strong medicine.

The voice of religion accordingly changed its tone. Liberalism dropped into the background, traditionalism came to the fore, equipped with modern inventions. An age of social and political crisis demanded 'a theology of crisis.' Liberal Protestantism had played a thin and cheerful tune, but something deeper and gloomier was needed for the new dark ages. Karl Barth provided it for European non-Roman Christianity, and the new scholastics, not uninfluenced by him, got busily to work in the Churches of Rome and England.

Schweitzer.

But one voice at least was raised before the storm broke, indicating a way for Liberalism which anticipated the looming period of crisis and transcended the inherent weaknesses of the Liberal Protestant position.

Albert Schweitzer, probably the most famous Christian of our time, super-eminent alike as scholar, musician, and missionary adventurer, produced in 1906 the book which in its English translation is called *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. Bringing to bear the resources of a very powerful and patient scholarship irradiated by mystical insight, he attacked the whole Liberal Protestant position on the very ground where it claimed to be strongest — Biblical Criticism. He demonstrated that, in rejecting as spurious those elements of the Gospels which did not conform to the nineteenth-century idea of what the founder of a world-religion should be like, the radical critics had been grossly subjective and unscientific. He showed that those rejected elements were in fact fundamental to the Gospel and could not be omitted without falsifying history in the interests of a modern prejudice. Jesus was not, after all, a nineteenth-century humanist dressed in first-century Palestinian clothes. He was the child as well as the Lord of His own age. Ideas which had been dismissed as importations into the original Gospel—the other-worldliness, the eschatology—belonged for good or ill to the very beginning.

But for Schweitzer this discovery — or rediscovery — was not a reason for abandoning Liberalism. Rather his mystical insight led him to transcend the limitations of the still-flourishing and unshellshocked Liberalism of the time and enabled him to penetrate to deeper levels. True, Jesus had spoken the language of His century, had clothed His ideas under the forms of thought current in his day; and that language was a dead language, those forms of thought were outmoded. But the insights into the nature of reality — the spiritual valuations — which the mysterious phrases expressed belonged to every age. The Gospels, faithfully studied, reveal a Jesus who is far more like the ecclesiastical Christ than he is like the Liberal Protestant prophet; but his significance is that of the 'imperious spiritual ruler of men's wills,' not that of the infallible doctrinaire. The forms in which His thought is manifested are those of the remote past; the spirit of His thought belongs to eternity, and therefore to the present.

The bold sweep of Schweitzer's mind and the massiveness of his scholarship scattered and dismayed the already crumbling forces of Liberal Protestantism. But to the traditionalists he brought even less comfort. Indeed it seemed to them that Schweitzer was

a more dangerous enemy of the Faith than Harnack had ever been; for if he restored to historicity the elements of the Gospel which had been discarded, he took them at their symbolical rather than their face value.

> 'These ideas,' wrote Professor Burkitt in his preface to the first English edition of *The Quest*, 'are the Christian hope, to be allegorized and "spiritualized" by us for our own use whenever necessary, but not to be given up so long as we remain Christians at all.'[4]

This was language which those who required their theological definitions to have the same sort of validity that belongs to the definitions of science found extremely disconcerting.

Meanwhile the greatest mystical-minded Liberal Christian of our time—a practical mystic if ever there was one—is probably the best-known and most admired Christian in the world to-day. Having, according to the traditional view, undermined the very foundations of Christianity, he has demonstrated the reality and the dynamism of Christian faith in a life of Christ-like service to the African natives amid the unhealthy swamps and jungle of Lambarene. There he has toiled—and still toils—acknowledging no ecclesiastical authority, rejecting as irrelevant the whole theological and metaphysical system by which Church orthodoxy sets such store, while heroically upholding in his life and work the values which that system professes to conserve.

Form-Criticism.

Before we leave our little survey of non-Roman Liberalism a word should be said about the small group of Biblical scholars in pre-Nazi Germany and in England who are known as 'Form Critics.' Schweitzer has founded no school, though many individual Christians have been profoundly influenced by him. The stage has been almost completely filled, in these bewildering years, by those who react against Schweitzer's thought as violently as they reacted against Harnack's. But it may be that the Form-Critics, applying yet another powerful solvent to the traditional system, are helping to prepare the way for the emergence of Mystical Liberalism as a potent force in years to come.

Briefly, the view of the Form-Critics is that the Gospels are not (as both the traditionalists and the older criticism assumed) in any sense biographies of Jesus, but 'pieces of missionary apologetic.'[5] In the words of Dr. R. H. Lightfoot, they are 'construc-

[4] *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (Black, 1910), p. vii.

[5] *The Redemption of Modernism*, by the Rev. Alan Richardson (Skeffington, 1935), chapter 2.

ions, works put together and arranged in accordance with a definite plan and purpose, which is never long forgotten.'[6]

In other words, when we read the Gospels we are not reading more or less straightforward history, but highly complex propagandist documents. A real light shines through them, but it is deeply coloured by the mind and outlook of the energetic institution which compiled, edited, and circulated them for its own purposes — as the light of the sun is sifted and arranged in colour-patterns by a stained-glass window.

In his Bampton Lectures for 1934 published under the title of *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, Dr. Lightfoot, after a careful study of the Gospels according to Mark and John in the light of the Form-Critical approach, sums up in these words:

> 'It seems, then, that the form of the earthly no less than of the heavenly Christ is for the most part hidden from us. For all the inestimable value of the Gospels, they yield us little more than a whisper of his voice; we trace in them but the outskirts of his ways. Only when we see him hereafter in his fulness shall we know him as he was on earth. And perhaps the more we ponder the matter, the more clearly we shall understand the reason for it, and therefore shall not wish it otherwise. For, probably, we are at present as little prepared for the one as for the other.'[7]

This passage gave great offence in many quarters; but it serves to indicate how far Liberal scholarship has moved from the position taken up by Liberal Protestantism forty years ago, and in conjunction with the work of Schweitzer, suggests the lines along which a virile mystical Liberalism may yet appear to face the present conservative reaction.

Roman Catholic Modernism.

We turn now for a glance at the Liberal movement in the Roman Church.

During the nineteenth century that Church had advanced rapidly along the lines of authoritarian pretension, and the influences which worked to strengthen a tendency visible in the earliest history of the Roman see achieved a notable triumph when the Vatican Council of 1870 made the decree of Papal Infallibility.

But inevitably thoughtful and independent minds among its membership became aware of the problems posed for religion by the growth of knowledge and science. Roman Catholic scholars, historians, philosophers—laymen like Lord Acton and Baron von Hügel — raised questions in their studies which led them into

[6] *History and Interpretation in the Gospels.* Bampton Lectures, 1934, xii.

[7] *ibid,* p. 225.

dangerous places. But they walked delicately, and being laymen, escaped the censure—or worse—which was waiting for accredited priests who tried to answer the questions.

Roman Catholic Modernism was never an organized movement. It emerged at the beginning of the century in the almost independent attempts of a few sensitive minds to resolve the contradictions of their position in the modern world. The outstanding names are those of Loisy in France and of George Tyrrell in England. Its line of approach was far more like that which Schweitzer was to take years later than it was like that of the Liberal Protestants; for whereas the latter bore hardly any resemblance to the Reformation Protestants, the Modernists believed themselves to be the very men whom God had raised up to defend Catholicism against its enemies. The work which first brought Loisy under grave suspicion was in fact a brilliant and scholarly attack on Liberal Protestantism in the interests of the Catholic religion. But the Pope showed that he placed no value on such championship. In a few years the fireworks were extinguished by the Encyclical *Pascendi* of 1907, and by drastic excommunications and the imposition of the anti-Modernist oath Modernism was thrust violently out of the Roman Church—or at least driven a long way under the surface. Loisy accepted defeat as marking the end of his career as a Catholic; but Tyrrell—with Irish illogicality, perhaps—never lost his love for the Church or his hope that it would come at last, from inward necessity or from outward provocation, to accept the succour that Modernism had offered it. Over his grave in the parish churchyard of Storrington, in Sussex, stands a stone inscribed, by his own direction, with the words: 'George Tyrrell: Catholic Priest,' and bearing the emblem of the chalice and paten.

It is difficult to see how the Roman Church, being what it was—and is—could have dealt with Modernism otherwise than it did. The late Miss Maude Petre, Tyrrell's devoted friend and champion, who remained a Roman Catholic to the end, though she spent her last years under severe ecclesiastical discipline, wrote in 1936—twenty years after the event—these words:

> 'Looking back on it all I can see how impossible it was for the Church not to make some pronouncement—and that pronouncement was a kind of supreme statement of the traditional position; of the Church as guardian of a religious deposit that nothing could alter or shake. Savagely she guarded her treasure, and struck out at those she accused of endeavouring to wrest it from her. And very surely I believe, now as then, that she has indeed been the custodian of religious truths and values that would have perished without her. But there was also at work, as there is in all institutions of human character, what Fogazzaro classed as "the spirit of immobility," and which I would also term "the spirit of

finality.'' She maintained that all was said—and all is never said. Because she was the supreme teacher she forgot that she must also be the supreme learner.' [8]

The Roman Church condemned Modernism because it cut at ıe root of the system it had been building and fortifying through ıe centuries. No one familiar with the history and apologetics of oman Catholicism can fail to be aware how completely it is ound up with the theory of itself as the one final, infallible ithority in all matters of faith and doctrine. There is a classic atement of this position in Newman's *Apologia* in which, start-g from the premiss of the existence of a God (which for him emed to be self-evident), he argued his way to the necessity, in fallen world, for the existence of an infallible Church, and the entification of that Church with the see of Rome. A book fre-ıently put into the hands of enquirers as an authoritative exposi-on of Roman Catholic doctrine states categorically :

> 'There are two ways in which a man may try to be a Catholic. He may study all the doctrines of the Church, and make up his mind that they are all reasonable and consistent with the Holy Scriptures, and so he may believe them all and become a Catholic. This is one way — and the wrong way. On the other hand he may, by God's grace, become convinced that God has appointed the Holy Church as his guide, and so be willing to accept and believe all she teaches, because it comes to him on the authority of God, and therefore *must* be true ; not because he himself sees *how* or *why* it is true. This is the right way. . . . ' [9]

This attitude underlies the whole of the imperial Roman atholic system, and it explains at once its strength in the presence human bewilderment, and its weakness in the face of such estioning as it received from the Modernists. It is so very simple the illiterate peasant, conscious of his inability to tackle the ieat problems of life, stands beside the cultured, thoughtful man, rmented with the conflict of opinion, and both alike are offered mething which strangely echoes a certain grim promise recorded the New Testament : ' I will give—and forgive—thee all if thou lt fall down and worship me.' It is an alluring promise, for it akes the Gospel easy where Jesus made it hard ; aiming to solve e problems created by human freedom by requiring the surrender that freedom to an external authority for the sake of peace. In tremendous allegory Dostoevsky pictures the Grand Inquisitor lking with Jesus, whom he has cast into prison. He knows who s prisoner is, and he makes a detailed apologia for his action. e tells how he had himself followed the Lord into the wilder-ss, living on roots and locusts, prizing the freedom of the

[8] *My Way of Faith* (Dent, 1937), p. 241.
[9] *The Threshold of the Catholic Church,* by Canon Bagshawe (Washburne), p. 3.

Gospel, until he realized that it was too hard a way for the mass of mankind.

> 'I awakened,' he tells the divine Prisoner, 'and would not serve madness. I turned back and joined the ranks of those *who have corrected Thy work.*'[10]

Jesus, who called men to follow Him in freedom, and who spoke to those who had ears to hear, promises—and asks—too much for human nature as it is generally found. Many are called but few are chosen; and the Roman Church, constituting itself the Church of the many, has *corrected the work of Jesus* in the interests of their unreadiness.

No wonder then that Tyrrell, keenly responsive to the truths which historical Catholicism had 'corrected,' deeply in love with the broken heart of mystical Catholicism, found himself worsted when his finger touched the sensitive nerve of totalitarian Catholicism. Never was the scholastic view of authority in religion submitted to a more eloquent and damaging criticism than in the books and articles which flowed from his pen during the last few years of his short life. Yet it was the criticism of one who believed himself to be the Church's truest friend. No one expounded more vividly and affectionately than he the claims of the Catholic Church to be, in all the colourful variety of its devotional life, the living representative of the religion of Christ. But from the Church's point of view his championship was radically defective. Conscious as he was of the impossibility of co-ordinating the Church's dogmatic system with the flood of new knowledge pouring in from so many directions, he attacked with breathless zeal the view that 'the faith once delivered to the saints' was a set of theological axioms on which all subsequent developments of doctrine were based by means of dialectical and logical processes. According to that view the Church is bound by every stage of the past, as the correctness of the answer to a complex mathematical problem depends on the correctness of every step leading to that answer. A Church so bound cannot modify its teaching except by assuming the correctness of its present conclusions and treating them as the premises of a new syllogism.

Tyrrell's method of breaking down this impasse was to distinguish between 'revelation' and 'theology.' Theology, he argued, is related to revelation as a science is related to its subject-matter, not as the conclusion of a syllogism is related to its premises, or as the books of Euclid are related to the primary assumptions of geometry.[11] The Church presented the develop-

[10] *The Brothers Karamazov* (Everyman), Vol. I, p. 252.

[11] Cf. *A New Model of the Universe*, by P. D. Ouspensky (Kegan Paul, 2nd Edn.), p. 24. Passage on Revelation.

ent of theology as a process in which statement was controlled by atement. Tyrrell presented it as a process in which statement as controlled by fact. In other words, he maintained that it was rfectly possible, and indeed imperative, for the Church to criti-ze and abandon its cherished rationalizations of Christian experi-ce without invalidating the dynamic reality of that experience.[12]

But he underestimated the strength of an organized mental bit developed by a powerful institution through nearly two ousand years of history. The project was greatly conceived, but was foredoomed to failure. Roman Catholic Modernism to-day but a memory. The old firm is running its business, as we might y, under 'entirely old management.'

he Present Position and the Prospects.

So much for the most recent large-scale—or rather influential—ovements of Liberalism within the organized Christian Churches. cannot be said that at the present day there is much to show for em. Liberalism to-day is in eclipse. We may play with the idea at a Liberal Pope might appear, with sufficient independence of dgment and strength of character to reverse the policy of his edecessors in regard to Modernism; but we can only do so by iling to realize how relentlessly an institution which has con-med itself in the way of self-aggrandizement takes charge of ose who profess to rule it in God's Name. If Rome had swal-wed the Modernist's medicine it might have saved its soul, but would have lost the whole world—or at least that world whose mination has become its one obsession. This is not to say that ere are not large numbers of Roman Catholics who are genuinely ligious and Christian. Individuals are often greater than the tion to which they belong, and Christians are often better than e Church to which they belong. But the Roman Church is un-kely to submit to any further attempt at doctoring, and must be ft to the possibly slow but ultimately inexorable pressure of ents.

In non-Roman Christianity Liberalism suffered no formal con-mnation, for there is no seat of authority from which condemna-on can be effectively pronounced. Nevertheless it has virtually sappeared from the centre of the stage. Liberal Protestantism as too academic—it took from religion not only what was super-tious and untenable, but also much that gave to it its character-

[12] See especially *Through Scylla and Charybdis* (Longmans, 1907). In this ok Tyrrell collected a number of essays written before his excommunication, me of them published in Roman Catholic periodicals, adding prefatory notes. e also *Mediaevalism, A Much Abused Letter, Christianity at the Cross ads*, etc.

istic quality and force. In the climate of prosperous optimism it made a show of vitality; it wilted in the sultry and thunderous atmosphere of distress and upheaval. Had it listened more to the Roman Catholic Modernists — or to Albert Schweitzer — it might have weathered the storm better.

The medical psychologist is familiar with the type of patient who, in middle age, is faced with a set of circumstances which demand an entirely new orientation of mind, but who, held fast by mental and emotional habit, shrinks from the prospect of adventure and retreats upon adolescent defences and ways of escape. The organized religious bodies seem to have gone through a similar process. The tremendous expansion of human knowledge and technical skill of the last century presented the historic Churches with just such a situation. But the risks of adventurous adjustment seemed too alarming, the forces that urged to it were insufficiently powered, the hold of the past was too strong. The Church, faced by the frightening unknown, took refuge in the comforting familiar. The old mediaeval and Reformation forts were re-occupied, and desperate efforts were made to render them capable of withstanding the onslaught of modern weapons. The ancient strongholds of tradition and authority were enthusiastically buttressed. The outstanding names in the intellectual life of the Church of England to-day are not, as they were forty years ago, those of Liberals boldly critical of Reformation or scholastic assumptions, but those of neo-scholastics and liturgiologists. The most prominent name in European Protestantism is that of Karl Barth, for whom Mysticism is nothing more than 'esoteric atheism.' 'Christian theology,' as Mr. George Seaver remarks, 'has once again come to be regarded as a matter primarily of cult and dogma.' [13]

But if, in point of fact, nineteenth century Liberalism has proved unequal to the rigours of twentieth century events, it cannot be said that the new mediaevalism is being conspicuously more successful. There is no sign of a religious revival on the basis of a resuscitated traditionalism. This does not mean that there is no interest in religion. Indeed seldom was there a keener hunger for assurance about those matters with which religion professes to be able to deal, or a greater dissatisfaction with the stale and tenuous pabulum of secular philosophies. But there is no indication that the Church is capable of satisfying this widespread appetite for faith. A trickle of converts — a few weary intellectuals among them — does little more than emphasize the heavy drift away from organized Christianity. A tiny coterie of professional theologians

[13] *Albert Schweitzer: Christian Revolutionary*, by the Rev. George Seaver (Clarke, 1944), p. 10.

iscuss matters which interest a few theologically-minded layfolk. here is no sign that the recent war will provoke a return of the an-in-the-street to the pew, any more than did the last war. Indeed everything points the other way. The historic Churches have ecome little more than refuges for small groups of devotees while he world goes its own restless way.

Quite frankly, I believe that the world — or at least that part f the world which is called Christendom — has entered upon an ge for which the Church's emphasis on history and its preoccupaons with the categories of rationalistic theology are increasingly eaningless. An Anglican priest, in a study of the thought of lbert Schweitzer, has recently written as follows:

> 'Rationalistic theology is not only a contradiction in terms, it is a presumption, an irreverence. It is an attempt to explain metaphysically what can only and at best be described symbolically. . . . Christ's life on earth has no significance for us if we regard it as history — as a past event. He can never be an object of knowledge, historically or empirically; He is only and always an object of faith, contemporaneously and intuitively. If all knowledge of the Jesus of history derived from records or traditions were obliterated, if Scripture and Church had never been, yet the Christ of faith's experience would still be invisibly present to the consciousness of the individual in whom His spirit dwells. . . . History can at best afford corroboration of the truth — if that truth is spiritual — which we already know by other means than sight.' [14]

It seems to me that the new Liberalism must be prepared to ıt loose from much that remains, for orthodox Christians, essenal to Christian faith, while at the same time holding fast to the haracteristic 'ideas' of Christianity — ideas which in their static petrified form have largely ceased to exercise their original ower. There are signs that such a Liberalism — mystical and ynamic — may emerge, as the impotence of conservatism to nswer the urgent needs of our revolutionary age becomes more nd more obvious. Meanwhile I claim and value my right, and am ot unmindful of my responsibility, as a priest of the Church of ngland. A year before his death George Tyrrell wrote to a iend:

> 'Believing the symbolic interpretation of Catholicism to be the true one, and that which must ultimately prevail, I believe I have a right to stay where I am. But the (Roman) Church has a government which at present views the symbolic interpretation as false.' [15]

consider it fortunate that the Church of England's form of overnment has so far prevented it from laying down authoritavely conditions of assent which would exclude what Tyrrell called he symbolic interpretation,' and has even done something, hrough the recent 'Report on Doctrine,' to make room within its

[14] *ibid.*, chapter 1.

[15] *Life of George Tyrrell*, by M. D. Petre (Arnold, 1912), Vol. II, p. 358.

borders for those who believe, as Tyrrell did, that it is the true one and must prevail.[16]

Meanwhile I would make my own some words from another letter of Tyrrell's:

> 'We can have no word of God,' he wrote, 'no revelation, except the ideal or eternal Man: the Christ. That is as much of God as we can ever *see*; but we can have the sense of the infinitely more and other that God is. It is only because He presents Himself to us as the Christ, with a human spirit, face, voice and hands, that we can speak to Him or deal with Him at all. Mystics think they touch the divine when they have only blurred the human form in a cloud of words. The best mysticism is to submit to the limitation *consciously*; to realize that our best God is but an idol, a temple made with hands. . . .'

He goes on to tell his friend:

> 'For you and me this is an escape from the prison of theology into the liberty of faith; but for the man in the street God and the idol fall together. . . . I fear we must look for an "abomination of desolation" . . . a desert of negation and materialism between the Egypt of the past and the Jerusalem of the future. My consolation is to recognize its necessity as a stage of purification. Tocqueville shows how the Revolution of 1789 could only rid itself of the evils of the Past by a temporary sacrifice of the interwoven values. The very names of the days and months and years were full of germs and associations. Excess is often the only road to moderation.'[17]

I feel those words are as true to-day as they were in 1908, and that we are indeed living through a time when old forms are being everywhere broken up. In the process it seems to many that good things are being lost or destroyed — that God is despised because the idols men have made of Him are ignored, that judgment is being heaped up for a godless and gainsaying generation. But surely it is only the wineskins that are being scrapped, and the worn-out images that are being judged. The molten metal of faith that in cooling became contorted into shapes no longer serviceable will be poured again, white hot, into new forms more suited to the needs of aspiring men. But it will be the same substance — 'religion lives through the death of religions.'

So there is no need for pessimism — the true Liberal believes, with Professor Bosanquet, in optimism, but he adds, with him, that

> 'no optimism is worth its salt that does not go all the way with pessimism and arrive at a point beyond it.'[18]

The true Liberal Christian is he who can see, beyond the scandal and confusion of our times, behind the chaos of thought and unfaith, the action of One who breaks only that He may build afresh and build better.

[16] *Doctrine in the Church of England* (S.P.C.K., 1938), p. 37.
[17] *Life of George Tyrrell*, Vol. II, p. 417.
[18] Quoted in *Indian Philosophy*, by S. Radhakrishnan (Allen & Unwin), Vol. I, p. 50.

THE ISLAND OF APHRODITE

By the Rev. John Todd, M.A., F.S.A., Rector of Waterstock, Oxford.

A BOOK dealing with any aspect of the Mediterranean is sure of a welcome these days, and when that book is as well ritten, as accurate and as pleasingly presented as Mr. Newman's ook on Cyprus,[1] its welcome is doubly sure. The book possesses commendatory introduction by a former Governor, Sir Richmond almer.

How strange it is that most Englishmen know so little of the ost recently acquired portion of the British Empire. And yet for any years Cyprus has been easily accessible, its climate makes a delightful place in which to live and its natural attractions, mbined with its historic interest, leave little to be desired. If esent conditions make it impossible for tourists to visit the island -day, Mr. Newman's book will give them some idea of the easure which they are missing.

Cyprus, lying within easy reach of Egypt, within sight of Asia inor and within sight of the coast of Syria (Ras Shamra is only miles away) has always been a meeting place of East and West, Semite and Aryan, of Christian and Moslem. It was longest-ved of the Crusader States, and for three hundred years, under e rule of the Lusignans, its court was one of the most brilliant Europe and the island was dotted with churches, abbeys and stles whose present ruins proclaim their past glories. In 1571 e Turks conquered the island, and three centuries later Britain ased it from the Sultan. Finally, when Turkey came into the ar against us in 1914, Britain annexed it, and in 1925 Cyprus was ade a Crown Colony. To-day Christians and Moslems live there harmony, and as one wanders through the tortuous streets of icosia, past many a sculptured fragment or coat of arms which nce adorned some Lusignan or Venetian mansion, one may see e long-haired Orthodox priest, in cassock and tall hat, seated tside some little coffee shop, vigorously puffing his *narghilé*, hd at the same time hear from the minaret of the mosque, which as once a cathedral, the mournful cadence of the muezzin: *La ha illa'llah—There is no deity but God.*

Situated so near the coast of Syria, the island was naturally sited in early times by Phoenicians from Tyre and Sidon, who me probably in search of timber and tar for shipbuilding. The

[1] *A Short History of Cyprus*, by Philip Newman. (Longmans; 1940.)

ancient traders made their headquarters at Kition, the modern Larnaca, and the name Kition was at one time applied to the whole island. In the Old Testament the inhabitants are called Kittim, or Chittim, and in the dirge over Tyre which Ezekiel sang (*Ezekiel* xxvii, 6) the prophet makes mention of the timber of the Chittim from which the Phoenicians made the decks of their ships. It was not, however, the timber but the copper of Cyprus which proved the chief attraction, for the island appears to have been the earliest place (certainly the earliest place in the Mediterranean area) where copper was worked. Legend attributed the discovery of copper to Cinyras, a mythical king of Cyprus, and the name of the metal is probably derived from the name of the island. In later days, when Cyprus had passed under the rule of the Romans, the Emperor Augustus leased the copper mines to Herod the Great, and that may partly account for the large number of Jews in Cyprus in Roman times.

Perhaps for most readers the chief interest of Cyprus lies in the fact that it was the earliest scene of the missionary labours of St. Paul. It was at Antioch that Paul and Barnabas took their momentous decision to carry the Gospel to foreign lands. Whither should they go? Cyprus was within easy reach of Seleucia, the port of Antioch, and moreover was the home of Barnabas. And so, accompanied by John Mark, the cousin of Barnabas, the apostles crossed over to the island and landed at Salamis. To-day the site of Salamis has almost disappeared, covered with sand, broken columns, marble capitals, fragments of pottery, tiles from the floors of bygone palaces and tiny pieces of mosaics which once made the walls of long-forgotten Byzantine churches glow with a golden light. Nevertheless, ruined and deserted as this site now is, to the Christian it must ever be memorable as the place where foreign missionary work began.

From Salamis the apostles made their way across the island to Paphos, the residence of Sergius Paulus, the Roman governor. The town stood on the seashore, but about 10 miles to the south-east of it stood another Paphos, sometimes called Old Paphos, the site of the notorious temple of Aphrodite, whose worship was at once the glory and the shame of Cyprus. The Greeks derived the name Aphrodite from *aphros*, meaning foam, and spoke of her as 'born of the foam,' and still on the seashore near Paphos the white foam gathers thick and is blown by the sea breeze about the ruined shrine of Aphrodite. But although the goddess had a Greek name she had not a Greek nature, for, indeed, she was not a Greek. The Phoenicians had brought with them to Cyprus their goddess Astart or Astarte, the Ishtar of the Babylonians. In the Old Testament

he is called Ashtoreth (*Judges* ii, 13), and it was this goddess, the goddess of the Zidonians' (*I Kings* xi, 5), whom Solomon worshipped in his old age, and who was identical with Asherah whose four hundred prophets confronted Elijah on Mount Carmel. Ashtoreth was the goddess of fertility and generation, the most widely worshipped deity in the Semitic world, and gradually, as she was adopted by the Greeks in Cyprus, her name was changed to Aphrodite,[2] and she became the goddess of love. But her nature did not change with her name, nor indeed did the licentious manner of her worship, and St. Athanasius did not exaggerate when he called that worship 'the deification of lust.' In St. Paul's day she had a temple at Corinth served by a thousand courtesans, and it was her worship there which stamped Corinth as 'the wanton city.' At Paphos it was no beautiful statue from the chisel of a Pheidias or a Praxiteles which represented her, but she was worshipped there under the form of a rough conical stone[3] which worshippers anointed with oil, and the representation of which appears on coins of Cyprus in the time of the Emperor Claudius. Little remains to-day of what was once one of the most famous — or infamous — temples of antiquity, but enough to show that the temple must have been Phoenician in character and utterly unlike any Greek or Roman temple. The cult of Aphrodite dies hard, and until recently it was the custom of Cypriote peasants every year to anoint the great corner-stones of the ruined temple of the Paphian goddess, and Cyprian peasant women may still be found who confuse the Virgin Mary with the Greek goddess, and invoke the Blessed Virgin as *Panaghia Aphroditessa — Our Lady Aphrodite.*

St. Paul does not appear to have come into conflict with this licentious worship, although he must have passed close by Aphrodite's shrine, but he evidently made straight for New Paphos,

[2] The name Aphrodite appears to be a sort of anagram on the Semitic name Ashtoret. The Greeks never had such a consonant as *sh,* and even now are incapable of pronouncing it. Hence for the sibilant *sh,* they substituted the labial *ph,* and for Ashtoret said Aphtoret. This, by an easy permutation, became Aphrotet, and was associated with *aphros,* meaning *foam.* Hence the legend that Aphrodite was born of the foam.

[3] This conical stone is called by Tacitus (*Hist.* ii, 3) a *meta.* One of the charges brought against the Knights Templars when the Order was dissolved in 1312 was that the Knights worshipped an idol called *Baphomet.* No satisfactory explanation of this word has been offered, and the commonly accepted explanation that *Baphomet* is a form of Mahomet has really nothing to recommend it. The mediaeval name of Paphos was Baffo. May not the idol which the Templars were accused of worshipping be the *meta* of *Baffo,* the *Baphomet*?

where he had his encounter with the sorcerer Elymas and converted the proconsul, Sergius Paulus, the first ruler to become a Christian. Barnabas and Mark revisited Cyprus, and tradition relates that Barnabas met his death in the island at the hands of the Jews and that his brother Aristobulus became the evangelist of Britain. The Church of Cyprus has always claimed Barnabas as its founder, and, in respect of apostolic foundation, to be on an equality with the Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch and Rome, for as the Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem regards himself as the successor of St. James, so the Archbishop of Cyprus regards himself as the successor of St. Barnabas. The Church of Cyprus is independent and self-governing, and was recognized as such by the General Council of Ephesus in 431, but the Patriarch of Antioch made strenuous efforts to bring it under his control, and it was not until 485 that the dispute was settled by one of those lucky finds, or a 'seasonable vision' as Gibbon would call it, which settled more than one controversy in the mediaeval Church. In obedience to a vision Anthemius, Bishop of Constantia, as Salamis was then called, dug under a certain tree, and there he found the body of St. Barnabas, and, with the saint's body, the very copy of St. Matthew's Gospel which the saint had used! Anthemius lost no time in going to Constantinople and taking with him the newly recovered body of the saint and the gospel found in his tomb, and presented the precious relics to the Emperor Zeno, who was overjoyed at receiving them and deposited them in one of the chapels attached to the Imperial Palace. The Emperor forthwith forbade the Patriarch of Antioch or any other prelate to interfere with the autonomy of the Church of Cyprus and constituted the Bishop of Constantia Archbishop of all Cyprus. Furthermore, he gave the Archbishop authority to sign his name on official documents in ink of imperial purple — a privilege possessed by no other bishop — to wear a vestment dyed with imperial purple and to carry a pastoral staff fashioned like an imperial sceptre. After nearly 1,500 years these privileges are still enjoyed by the Archbishop of Cyprus. Considering the size of the island, the Church of Cyprus is remarkable for the number of local saints which it honours, for no less than one hundred and ten of its saints are purely local and peculiar to the Cypriote Church.

A Cypriote saint worthy of special remembrance is St. John the Almsgiver, to whom the Orthodox Cathedral in Nicosia is dedicated. Born at Amathus, the modern Limasol, on the south coast of Cyprus, he became famous for his acts of charity, and when he became Patriarch of Alexandria the care of the poor and destitute was his chief concern. Terrible events soon afforded a wider scope

or his charitable zeal, for in 614, when the Persians captured and well-nigh destroyed Jerusalem, it was John the Almsgiver who ministered to the suffering population and helped to rebuild the ruined city. Two years later Alexandria fell into the hands of the Persians and John returned to his native Cyprus, where he died. But so great was the reputation for charity which he had won during the horrors of the Persian invasion that in after years the chapel of the hospital in Jerusalem was dedicated to him, and when the Order of the Knights Hospitallers was founded and they took charge of the hospital shortly after 1100 A.D., it was St. John the Almsgiver who naturally became their patron saint. But as the wealth and power of the Hospitallers increased, they felt, it may be, a little ashamed of such an obscure patron saint and took another and more famous John, John the Baptist, who supplanted the humble Almsgiver. Nevertheless, the original John of the Knights Hospitallers, and consequently of their modern organization, the St. John Ambulance Brigade, is the old Almsgiver of Cyprus.

By far the most dramatic event in the history of Cyprus, and one that was destined to influence enormously the future history of Church and State in the island, was its sudden capture by our crusading king, Richard Coeur de Lion.

The Third Crusade had begun, and in the spring of 1191 Richard sailed from Messina for the Holy Land, and in his fleet was a vessel carrying his sister Joan, Dowager Queen of Sicily, and Berengaria, his affianced bride. On Good Friday, April 12th, a tempest scattered his ships, and Richard's vessel was driven to take refuge in the harbour of Rhodes, where later it was joined by the rest of his fleet with the exception of Berengaria's vessel and two others which had been driven by the storm towards the coast of Cyprus. One of these vessels was wrecked, and those who managed to escape to the shore were arrested, plundered and thrown into prison. Berengaria's ship weathered the storm and succeeded in reaching the roadstead of Limasol on the south coast. At that time Cyprus was nominally part of the Byzantine Empire, but in fact it was ruled by Isaac Comnenus, who had rebelled against the Emperor and set himself up as Emperor of Cyprus. When Isaac, a man of vicious character, heard of the arrival of Berengaria's ship he invited the fugitives to come ashore, and when they declined he prepared to attack them. The situation was desperate, but at the critical moment, just as Isaac was about to attack, Richard with the rest of his fleet arrived in the bay. Great was the wrath of the English king when he heard the story of Isaac's misdeeds, and he at once sent envoys to demand full and instant

satisfaction for the injuries which his people had suffered. The demand was refused, and thereupon, on May 6th, Richard landed his army, attacked Isaac and his men, who broke and fled before the onslaught of the English and Norman knights, and Limasol was soon in the hands of the invaders. The king was not the man to waste time when fighting was afoot, and he followed up his victory by an attack on the Cypriote camp, and, although Isaac escaped, his camp with enormous plunder, treasure chests, horses, armour, tents and the imperial banner, were captured. This banner was afterwards presented by the king to the Abbey of Bury St. Edmund's, where it remained one of the abbey's cherished possessions until it disappeared amid the wreckage and plunder of the Dissolution. On Sunday, May 12th, Richard was married to Berengaria in the cathedral of Limasol and on the same day she was crowned Queen of England. Surely few brides have had so exciting a honeymoon as Berengaria! Straight from the nuptial festivities, Richard, ever a lover of fighting, in one rapid campaign subdued the island and captured Isaac, whom he put in silver chains as he had promised not to put him in iron fetters. The fallen tyrant was handed over to the Knights Hospitallers, who imprisoned him in their Syrian castle of Margab, where he died.

But what was Richard to do with the island that had fallen so unexpectedly into his hands? His business was to push on to Acre with all possible speed to join in the siege, and not to waste time or soldiers in Cyprus, and so, anxious to turn his new conquest to quick profit, he sold the island to the Knights Templars for 100,000 bezants. But the Templars had difficulty in holding the island and, quickly repenting of their bargain, begged Richard to resume possession, and so Richard again had the island on his hands.

Four years before these events took place (1187), Saladin had inflicted a crushing defeat upon the Crusaders and had captured Jerusalem, and consequently Guy of Lusignan, king of Jerusalem, had lost his kingdom. Hence arose an ironical situation—Cyprus a kingdom without a king, Guy de Lusignan a king without a kingdom. The solution was obvious, and Richard handed over Cyprus to the dispossessed Guy, who took possession of his new kingdom in 1193. Thus began the dynasty of the Lusignans, a dynasty which supplied no less than eighteen monarchs to the throne of Cyprus and which ruled the island for the next three hundred years.

The rule of this French family (the Lusignans came from Lusignan near Poitiers) was bound to bring about great and speedy changes in the Church life of Cyprus. What *modus vivendi* ought

be established between the rulers, who were of the Roman hurch, and their subjects who were of the Greek Orthodox hurch of the island? The solution proposed by the Roman clesiastics was as simple as it was drastic, *viz.* the complete bordination of the Orthodox bishops, clergy and people to the oman bishops. Naturally the Greeks resisted, but their resist-ce was of no avail, and in 1260 the matter was finally settled by ope Alexander IV, who issued his *Bulla Cypria*, the result of ich was that the native Orthodox Church of Cyprus, the Church unded by St. Barnabas, adorned by the fame of Spyridon and . Epiphanius, the Church hitherto reckoned independent and tonomous, was disendowed and disestablished in favour of the oman Church, and the Greek bishops were compelled to retire the small out-of-the-way villages.

Cyprus continued to serve as a useful base of supplies for the usaders, and when those warriors were finally driven out of the oly Land in 1921 it was to Cyprus that the Templars and the ospitallers retired. The Hospitallers made their headquarters, Grand Commandery, in the great castle of Colossi, and it is on e estates of this rich 'commandery' that the famous wine known *commanderia* is still grown. To-day the banner of the Knights ospitallers, the white cross on a red field, floats proudly over the stle, for in 1915 this magnificent ruin with its keep built by the nights in 1454, and its massive walls ten feet thick, was pur-ased by the English branch of the Order, whose headquarters e at St. John's Gate, Clerkenwell, as a memorial of the days ent by the Hospitallers in Cyprus.

The three hundred years during which the House of Lusignan led Cyprus was the most brilliant period in the history of the and. It saw the building of the Abbey of Bella Paise, surely e most beautiful Gothic ruin in the Latin East, the period in ich were built the great cathedrals of Nicosia and Famagusta, ose architecture rivals that of the best Gothic cathedrals of ance. To kings of Cyprus writers so widely different as St. omas Aquinas and Boccaccio dedicated works, and King Peter I 359-1369), the last but the least romantic figure of the Crusades, ct only revived the crusading spirit but did, in fact, lead what was ally the last Crusade. Under vow from his youth to perpetual rfare against the Saracens, he founded the Order of the Sword, edged the members of that Order to carry on the struggle for e recovery of the Holy Land, and gave to them the motto *Pour auté maintenir*. Twice King Peter went the rounds of the courts Europe to raise men and money for the crusade and in 1363 me to London. Here Edward III gave him a great ship,

Catharine, and Henry Picard, Master of the Vintners' Company, entertained him to dinner, when he had no less than four kings as his fellow-guests — the Kings of England, Scotland, France and Denmark.[4] It was under the leadership of this King of Cyprus that the Crusaders attacked Egypt and stormed the city of Alexandria in 1365, and it is not without interest to recall that the 'verray parfit gentil knight,' whom Chaucer describes amongst the Canterbury pilgrims, was in this army of King Peter: 'At Alisaundre he was whan it was wonne.'

An interesting trace of the bygone greatness of the House of Lusignan still survives in a most unexpected quarter. Hugh III inherited the nominal title of King of Jerusalem, and was indeed crowned as such in the cathedral of Famagusta in 1269, and his successors on the throne of Cyprus continued to use the title. Henceforth the two crowns were united. In 1393 another crown was, at least nominally, added to those of Cyprus and Jerusalem, for when Leo VI, the last King of Armenia, died in exile he bequeathed his title to the throne of Armenia (he had nothing but the title to bequeath) to his kinsman, James I, King of Cyprus. The result of all this was that when Queen Charlotte, the last legitimate Lusignan ruler of Cyprus, married Louis, Duke of Savoy, in 1458, she brought to her husband a triple crown, or rather, what is not quite the same thing, the empty titles to three kingdoms. From that Duke of Savoy the present royal house of Italy is descended, and hence the King of Italy still to-day styles himself King of Cyprus, of Jerusalem and of Armenia!

In the fifteenth century the power of the Lusignans rapidly declined and Venice cast covetous eyes upon the island. James II had married a Venetian lady, the beautiful Caterina Cornaro, and Venice adopted the bride as the city's own daughter. Shortly afterwards the king died in suspicious circumstances. He was succeeded by his infant son, James III, who also died almost immediately afterwards, likewise in suspicious circumstances, and the way was now open for Venetian interference. In 1489 Venice persuaded Caterina Cornaro to abdicate (really she had no choice in the matter), and for the next eighty-two years the Venetians ruled the island. The rule of the great trading republic was selfish and grasping, but for us the chief interest of the period lies in the fact that Shakespeare's greatest tragedy, *Othello, the Moor of Venice*, is placed in 'a Sea-port in Cyprus' during this time of

[4] There is a modern inscription in the Vintners' Hall, Upper Thames Street, recording this feast of the five kings, but it calls the King of Cyprus Amadeus. It is difficult to account for the mistake as no king of that name ever reigned in Cyprus.

enetian occupation. The play is founded upon a story by Cinthio eraldi, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Ferrara, out a certain Moor who was Governor of Cyprus. Can we iden- fy this Moor whose tragic story became the theme of Shakes- eare's play? The Italian word *moro* not only means a Moor, it so means a mulberry, and the well-known Venetian family of loro bore, as their coat of arms, two azure bends on a silver shield nd in the chief, in allusion to their name, three mulberries. This mily of Moro supplied many men to the public services of enice, Christophero Moro being Doge in 1462, Damiano Moro dmiral of the Fleet in 1482, and no less than three of the family ere Governors of Cyprus, Christophero Moro in 1505, Sebastian loro in 1519 and Giovanni Moro in 1535. May not the writer of e story have confused the family name Moro with Moro mean- g a Moor, and thus turned the chief character in his story into Moor? If that were so, then the original of Othello would be one the well-known Moro family. Be that as it may, Shakespeare ok the story of the Moor as he found it and treated it as he alone uld treat it, and since the British occupation one of the towers of e citadel of Famagusta has received, not inappropriately, the me Othello's Tower.

Meanwhile it was clear that the Turks must, sooner or later, ll upon the island, and the Venetians prepared for the coming tack by building those great ramparts which are such a conspicu- is feature of Nicosia and Famagusta to-day. They had not long wait. Selim, Sultan of Constantinople, well named 'The Sot,' as a drunkard whose favourite drink was the famous *com- anderia* wine of Cyprus, and this royal wine-bibber determined annex the island which produced such a delectable vintage. In 70 the attack was launched, Nicosia was captured after hard hting, and next year the Turks laid siege to Famagusta. Here e Venetians under the command of the heroic Bragadino resisted th superhuman courage for nearly a year, and when at last they rrendered, the Turkish general, who had promised to spare the e of the gallant Bragadino, had that hero tortured, flayed alive d his skin stuffed and sent to Constantinople. Some years later e body of the gallant Venetian captain was bought by his sons d brothers and brought to Venice, where it now rests in the urch of Giovanni e Paolo, the Westminster Abbey of Venice.

To-day Famagusta is a mere skeleton of what it once was, a rt of 'mediaeval Pompeii.' Its mediaeval palaces and most of mediaeval churches have gone, sold by the Turks in the nine- enth century as building stone for Port Said and the Suez Canal. fact, of its numerous mediaeval churches only one remains in

Christian use to-day, the church built by the great merchant prince Sir Henry Lachas, the Dick Whittington of fourteenth-century Famagusta, who more than once entertained his king in sumptuous fashion. Lachas was a Nestorian and the church was built for Nestorian Christians, but as there are no longer any Nestorians in Cyprus the church is now used by the Orthodox Greeks, who call it St. George the Exiler. The name refers to a curious custom. If a man wishes to get rid of an enemy all he has to do is to take a little dust from the Church of St. George the Exiler and drop it in his enemy's house, and within a year his enemy will have disappeared from home. But the ritual must be used with caution, for on no account must the man pass through the city gate carrying the dust. Consequently if his enemy lives outside the city, he must throw the packet of dust over the rampart, pass through the city gate and pick it up, and then the Exiler can be relied upon to do his part.

We cannot take leave of Cyprus without mentioning one interesting old relic associated with our own country which was recovered by the merest chance a few years ago. A sponge-fisher, working outside the harbour of Famagusta, happened to notice an old gun lying at the bottom of the sea. It was raised to the surface and turned out to be an old bronze cannon bearing the arms of Henry VIII and of De L'Isle Adam, Grand Master of the Knights Hospitallers, and on the breach of the gun was the number xiiii. These markings were sufficient to connect the gun with an episode in our own history. In 1522 the Turks captured Rhodes from the Knights Hospitallers, and five years later the Grand Master De L'Isle Adam, came to England to beg help from Henry VIII for the recapture of Rhodes. The king received him graciously and is said to have given him nineteen guns and one thousand and twenty-three cannon balls. Nothing more was known of the incident until, four centuries later, the gun (apparently No. xiiii of the nineteen promised) was fished up unexpectedly from the bottom of Famagusta harbour. Was the vessel which carried it sunk in some long-forgotten engagement with the Turks? We do not know; but the discovery, small as it is, is one which cannot fail to grip the imagination.

PERSONAL IMPRESSIONS OF CONTINENTAL PROTESTANTISM

By the Rev. N. H. Fisher, B.A., C.F. (retired).

MY contacts with European Protestantism have been made while serving as an Army Chaplain during the momentous mpaigns of 1944 and 1945. Unfortunately it was not possible find out a great deal about the French Protestant Churches, rtly because of the swiftness of our advance and partly because e happened to be in predominantly Roman Catholic areas during ir static period on French soil. One contact, however, stands it vividly in the mind, and that was more or less by chance. We d stopped for the night at a little mining village near Lens, and ere expecting to push forward the next day. Early in the morn- g, however, before most of the men were awake, we were sur- ised to find people from the village coming round the lorries d trucks with jugs of warm coffee. It was only ersatz coffee, but was the best that they could offer and the gesture was much preciated. I asked one of the ladies if there was a Protestant urch in the neighbourhood, and she immediately replied that ere was and that she would be happy to guide me to it without lay, if I wished to go there. The church itself was nothing more an a large hut, very sparsely furnished in the reformed tradition. o be quite frank, the place itself tended to chill one, but a con- rsation with several of the leading members of the congregation on made one realize that here was a living fellowship of devoted hristian people. This particular church was only a mission, being rked together with a mission in another village from the town urch at Lens. Services were held by the pastor from Lens ery other Sunday, with an average attendance of '*une soixant- ne*,' but a crowded Sunday School was maintained every Sunday. ese devoted people were at that moment living under the adow of a great loss, as their pastor together with his wife and ild had been killed as a result of our own bombing. Neverthe- s this little company at Wingles were determined to carry on d to keep the flag of Evangelical Christianity flying in the dst of their little community. The few Church members whom net impressed me with the deep quality of their Christian experi- ce, and in spite of all misfortune they were full of hope and nfidence for the future.

Protestantism in Belgium is but a tiny minority and its main organization is the *Eglise missionaire Belge*, which is very akin to French Protestantism both in outlook and forms of worship. The churches of this community are confined almost entirely to the larger towns. My only experience of them was in Brussels, where they are respected by their fellow-citizens and exert a very definite moral influence on the life of the city. Congregations are large, and although the churches are plain and unadorned they are nevertheless beautiful in a quiet and unostentatious way. In one church there was a Cross on the Holy Table, and although not in our sense liturgical the service followed a definite and well-planned order. My visit to this particular church happened to be on Christmas morning, and the service included some very fine singing by both choir and congregation. The ministry of both Word and Sacrament was observed, as there was an adult baptism before the sermon and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to follow. Nearly the whole of the large company remained for the Communion, which was celebrated with great reverence and simplicity. It is not the practice in the Belgian Missionary Church to kneel, but one could not fail to be impressed with the spectacle of row after row of men and women going up to the Lord's Table, where in accordance with the Primitive Church custom they received the Sacrament standing. As with all Continental Protestants, the preaching of the Word occupies a foremost position in the service, and the pastors I was privileged to hear certainly had a very high conception of their responsibility of proclaiming the Good News. It was preaching of an exceptionally high order—rooted and grounded in the Scriptures, but alive and alert to the issues of the present day. Preaching of this high quality cannot fail to influence the youth of Belgium, who are without any definite church attachment. The hold of the Roman Church in Belgium is not so great as one might think. Not all churches are full and there is much criticism on the part of the laity, and quite a considerable section of the population, especially in working-class areas, is agnostic or even atheist.

I was surprised to find quite a large Pentecostal Church in the centre of Brussels and discovered a respectably-sized congregation, which was characterized by its fervour and enthusiasm. It was good to hear Sankey's hymns and choruses sung with such *éclat* in French, and the fervent singing of *'Place a Jésus, roi de gloire'* will not readily be forgotten. The service was in charge of a little man possessed of great energy and vocal ability, and his words were punctuated, as at similar services in this country, with cries of approval and jubilation. The majority of the people

this company seemed poor, but quite clearly they had found something which made them passing rich.

One crossed the border in more senses than one when going from Belgium into Holland. In Belgium the dominating ecclesiastical influence is the Roman Catholic Church, whilst in Holland it is the Dutch Reformed Church, although in Southern Holland there is a population which is almost solidly Catholic. Unhappily the Protestants of the Netherlands have been shaken by theological controversy, but during the German occupation a new spirit seemed to permeate the Church and the prevailing tendency is now towards friendliness and unity rather than towards division, as was the case before the war. Conflict has raged most fiercely around the Fundamentalist-Liberal controversy, and it has given rise to two distinct parties in the Church which in many cases have been so estranged that they hold services at different times. Some forty years ago the same issue caused a real split in the State Church, and a new Calvinistic community emerged which to-day boasts a membership of 750,000 people. This body is rigidly fundamentalist and unfortunately there is little reciprocity between it and the National Church. However, the war and the common persecution has brought about a different spirit, which let us hope is the beginning of new and better things for the religious life of Holland. Another encouraging result of the occupation period is the growing friendliness between the Roman Catholics and the Dutch Protestants. They will lend their churches to each other in areas where one of the parties has suffered the loss of its building, and I know of one gathering which was addressed by a Roman priest and a Protestant minister. Prayers were said by both Protestants and Catholics, and perhaps the most encouraging feature of all is the fact that the meeting was conceived and organized by a small group of Roman Catholic laity.

It was my privilege to be present at one service of the Dutch Reformed Church in a large village near Zutphen. One was impressed by the large congregation, the slow solemnity of the singing and the simple dignity of the service. The pulpit dominates in the Dutch church, and a table is brought in for the Communion, around which the communicants sit in relays. There is a movement afoot in Dutch Protestantism for a more frequent observance of this sacrament, and some ministers are anxious for a weekly observance. Perhaps the most unforgettable element in this particular visit was something that happened in the vestry before the service began. Deacons and minister were there together for prayer before going into the church. An extemporaneous prayer was offered by one of the deacons—a poor man, just an

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC LIBRARY

ordinary Dutch peasant—but it was a prayer instinct with spiritual life and power and set the tone for the service. As we filed into the church the congregation rose to its feet and pastor and deacons solemnly made their way to the front. Immediately the minister reached the foot of the pulpit steps the organ stopped its music; there was deep stillness for a moment or two of silent prayer; then the music broke out again and the pastor mounted the steps ready to begin the praise part of the service. One has been present at solemn and moving services among Catholics and Orthodox Christians, but none were more impressive than this. One could, as it were, sense the pressure of God's presence during those moments of solemn stillness.

And what of the Church in Germany? Of course conditions vary in different parts of the country, but I should say, in so far as it is possible to speak generally, that since the end of the war church attendance has greatly increased. Towards the end of the Nazi régime in many districts all kinds of indirect pressure was brought to bear upon the people not to go to church. In one case ration cards were distributed at the same time as the church service, and of course this meant an empty church. In the main church in Wolfenbuttel, with a seating capacity of over 2,000, congregations had shrunk to some thirty elderly people: now they average over 400. In a village of Northern Hanover I have seen the country people simply streaming to church, some on bicycles, some in traps, and others on foot. This, however, had always been a church-going district. One pastor told me that in districts where the Pietistic revival of the eighteenth century had left its mark church attendance was good; in areas untouched by the Pietistic movement church attendance was correspondingly poor.

German pastors impressed me favourably. I met those who had suffered persecution, including Pastor George Althaus, whose cousin is the famous Professor Paul Althaus of Erlangen, and whose parents were for many years missionaries in Africa. Pastor Althaus had been imprisoned twice by the Nazis, once for praying on behalf of the Jews and again for rebuking members of the Hitler Youth who came into church with arms upraised in the Hitler salute. He gave me a copy of three sermons preached by Professor Althaus in 1939, and these were models of expository Biblical preaching, one hundred per cent. Christian and one hundred per cent. orthodox in their content. Most of the pastors were very concerned about the Russian administration and were afraid that the Church would suffer in that area. I only met one pastor who had been a member of the Deutsche Christen party, and he told me that originally the Deutsche Christen had put for-

ard a policy of one German Church for the German nation and a parate Jewish Church for Jewish Christians, *but reciprocity and llowship between the two bodies*. When the Nazi Government w that instead of achieving a rapid '*Anschluss*' among themlves the German Protestants spent their time in wrangling about eological points, they (the Government) lost patience and beme anti-church in their policy. Prior to this they had paid lip rvice to the ideal of a Christian State.

With regard to the activities of the Church, one noticed with atification that large numbers of Confirmation classes were being ld everywhere, and Bible Classes in the week-time for older eople were attracting as many as a hundred people in one town arish. In Luneburg and Hamburg it was encouraging to learn out the '*Evangelische Woche*' and '*Volksmission*' experiments. he first, or 'Evangelical Week,' is a series of services on each vening of the week, with an address at each one and a celebration the Lord's Supper as a climax to the series. The '*Volksmission*,' People's Mission, was a series of mission services with popular octrinal teaching on Luther's catechism on each evening of the eek. The average attendance on any one evening of these exeriments was from 300 to 400. Could we achieve anything like at in any of our parish churches?

Sects are not so numerous in Germany as in this country, but Brunswick I was able to visit a Catholic 'Apostolic' church for service which was addressed by an 'Angel' and a 'Bishop,' who, owever, were both business men in the week-time. At this service here was a large and enthusiastic attendance, of which the majority ere young people. This was in strong contradistinction to the utheran Church, where older people very definitely predominated.

One of my most cherished memories of contacts with the hristians of Germany is my meeting with Herr Lopau of Luneurg. Herr Lopau is a Moravian, but he is helping to run a utheran Mission in a poor part of Luneburg and I was privileged o accompany him to the service. It was well attended and we ang Sankey's hymns, but this time in German. Herr Lopau preded and gave a very simple but deeply spiritual address, and ne felt that here, whatever its outward defects, was worship in pirit and in truth. I remember singing with Herr Lopau and his amily the old hymn 'Come to the Saviour, make no delay.' We ang it in English, as our friend is a teacher of languages and peaks excellent English. Herr Lopau was a Wermacht officer uring the war but never compromised with his Christian beliefs. Naturally he never became a Nazi and maintained a definite hristian witness throughout. He is the kind of man we English

Church people need to contact, and through whom we can work towards a better understanding with the German Churches.

Continental Protestantism is not so uncatholic as many in this country are inclined to assume, and there are some very definite sacramental tendencies to be discerned there. Pastor Hildebrandt says that the Reformation, instead of being a centrifugal movement, was definitely oecumenical. It is true that the reformers broke with the older Church with regret, but where the alternative was one between Ancient Church Order and what they conceived to be Scriptural truth, they felt that it was the will of God that they should choose the latter. Many of them, more notably Bucer and Melancthon, worked for an organic union of all Evangelical Christians and even conceived the possibility of reunion with Rome. Have we of the Church of England a part to play in achieving the oecumenical ideals of the Reformation? If we have then our first business is to try to put aside prejudice and to seek to understand our Protestant neighbours in a spirit of truthfulness and charity. We must not mislead them as to our doctrinal and historical position and differences of view point and emphasis must be frankly, prayerfully and charitably faced together. In this spirit we should travel far along the road to Christian unity.

THE COMING OF THE SON OF MAN

By William E. Wilson, B.D.

ONE of the greatest problems of the New Testament is what is scientifically known as Eschatology, and in more popular language as 'The Second Coming of Christ.' As it has from time to time been taught in the Christian Church, and especially by small sects and coteries, this doctrine has several disquieting features, but its greatest difficulty is that many passages in the Gospels which purport to report the words of Jesus can scarcely be understood in any other sense than that:

> He would return in glory very soon;
> Miraculously remove His followers to Heaven;
> Judge the world, condemning the vast majority of its inhabitants to terrible punishment, later always interpreted as eternal torment;
> And the world itself would be destroyed.[1]

[1] It is to be noted that neither of the last two ideas are *explicitly* stated in the eschatological passages in the Gospels, but they have been generally understood as implied. The third is stated definitely in *II Thess.* and the fourth in *II Peter*. Both became accepted as parts of the Apocalyptic tradition of the Church, and the third dominated orthodox Christian thought for many centuries.

All this was, and by some Christians is still, regarded as the mighty coming triumph of God, the vindication of Divine justice, and as the ultimate meaning of the Kingdom of God, which was the great subject of the teaching of Jesus. There are at least three strong reasons for thinking that this teaching cannot be true. The first is that it was to happen shortly and has not happened yet. The second is that nearly every thoughtful person feels that there is here a moral contradiction of almost all the words of Jesus about God's attitude to mankind. The third is that the destruction of the world and mankind (all except the comparatively few 'saved') seems more like the confession of Divine failure than the triumph of God. And we might add that to call it the coming of the Kingdom of God is curious. For one would suppose that that term would mean God's Kingdom being established where it was not complete before, that is, on earth, rather than taking a small minority of the inhabitants of earth away to heaven, where the Kingdom always had been perfect.

Until about thirty-five years ago most theologians and Biblical scholars, and the vast majority of Christians, almost contrived to forget that such teaching appeared in the New Testament. It was, on the whole, left to Plymouth Brethren and other Second Adventists. Then came a bombshell and blew away our complacency. Albert Schweitzer published *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, translated into English as *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, in which it was maintained, not merely that Jesus taught eschatology, but that the apocalyptic element was the essence of His message and the moral teaching was entirely subsidiary to it.

The purpose of the present paper is to suggest that if we start from the very passage in the Gospel of *Matthew* from which Albert Schweitzer started, 'Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come,' and interpret that phrase 'Son of Man' in the light of its derivation, as Dr. W. T. Manson has done in his *Teaching of Jesus*, we get at least the possibility that all this teaching has a very different meaning from that accepted hitherto. In what follows I do not attempt to do more than suggest the general outline of this reconstruction, with the addition of some confirmation from the Pauline Epistles. Many questions still remain unanswered. But I am persuaded that they are answerable along the line suggested.

I.

In the *Teaching of Jesus* (p. 211 *ff*) Dr. Manson discusses the meaning and derivation of the designation 'Son of Man.' In the Gospels, and particularly after Peter's confession 'Thou art the Christ,' Jesus uses the term to designate Himself, and after

Caesarea Philippi, always either in connection with His coming sufferings or when foretelling His triumph. The words themselves are simply a common Aramaic way of saying 'man.' *Psalm* viii, 4 shews that Hebrew had a similar usage. In our Lord's mouth the words recall the vision of *Daniel* vii, in which the Son of Man comes on the clouds of heaven to the Ancient of Days, who gives Him an everlasting kingdom over all the earth and all peoples. In the somewhat later *Similitudes of Enoch* the Son of Man is mentioned more frequently. His rôle is Messianic, both as leader and ruler of the righteous and as judge and destroyer of the wicked. Since the discovery of the *Book of Enoch* it has been assumed that it influenced Jesus in taking the title 'Son of Man,' and that therefore both the other-worldly point of view of that book's eschatology and its emphasis on the destruction of the wicked were probably shared by Him. This was generally assumed by scholars before Manson's book was published. He pointed out that in the interpretation of the Son of Man vision in the latter part of *Daniel* vii it is made abundantly clear that the Son of Man is *not* an individual but the 'people of the saints of the Most High,' that is, the truly loyal Israelites. It is thus equivalent in meaning to Isaiah's 'Righteous Remnant,' and to the 'Servant of Jahveh' of *Deutero-Isaiah*, and

> 'stands for the manifestation of the Kingdom of God *on earth* in a people wholly devoted to their heavenly King' (*op. cit.*, p. 227. Italics mine).

He then says, and here comes the new point, that in one at least of the places in which Jesus used the term it is very difficult to think that He means Himself, for He seems to suggest that Elijah —here almost certainly meaning John the Baptist—is included in the meaning of the term (*Mark* ix, 12).[2]

Dr. Manson's view then is this, that it is much more probable that Jesus was familiar with the book of *Daniel* than that he knew *Enoch*, and that the identity in meaning between *Daniel's* Son of Man and the Remnant of *Isaiah* and the Servant of *Deutero-Isaiah* makes it additionally probable that He used the words 'Son of Man' in a collective sense. Or rather that He thought in terms of the collective sense of the 'Son of Man,' but that in the latter days of His ministry, when it was clear that He was not going to win either the whole Jewish people or even any considerable part of them, those wholly devoted to their heavenly King had been reduced to Himself alone. The remnant had become one man. This makes it probable that the impression gained as we read one

[2] This point had so far as I knew been first noticed by Dr. A. T. Cadoux, and published in the *Interpreter*, Vol. 18. Though I read this when it first appeared, I have not been able to refer to it, having lost my copy.

or two passages, that Jesus speaks of the Son of Man as if He were speaking of someone else, is correct. For example, 'Whosoever shall be ashamed of me . . . of him shall the Son of Man be ashamed,'[3] is unnatural if by Son of Man He meant simply Himself. It is natural if in it He associated all who in the future, through His work, should be wholly devoted to the heavenly King. Another confirmation is the way in which, after foretelling the Passion, He turns to the disciples and warns them to take up the cross and follow Him.[4] Manson asks if it is not possible that at one time Jesus expected some of His disciples to be crucified with Him. Even the certainty that the Son of Man must suffer, which almost dominates the last part of the ministry, may have owed something to *Daniel*, for twice in the interpretation of the vision the suffering of the Saints of the Most High is stressed, though the word suffering is not used (*Dan.* vii, 21 and 25).

One other point must be emphasized. If *Enoch* thinks of destruction of the world and an entirely other-worldly hope for the righteous, *Daniel* makes it clear that the hope is for this world. This world is to be God's Kingdom. If Jesus, then, all the time had *Daniel*, not *Enoch*, in His mind, is it not likely that to Him the Kingdom of God meant *this* world transformed, and not only Heaven beyond? We shall find reason to think so from the very passage which started Schweitzer on his great eschatological study.

II.

Schweitzer tells us that it was the words of *Matt.* x, 23, 'Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of Man be come,' which set him on to the research published in *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*. In *My Life and Thought*, p. 18, he says:

> 'He tells them . . . that the appearance of the Son of Man will take place before they have gone through the cities of Israel, *which can only mean that the celestial Messianic Kingdom will be revealed while they are thus engaged*. (Italics mine.) He has, therefore, no expectation of seeing them return.'

If the coming of the Son of Man be understood in the sense of the Apocalyptists, as for instance represented by *Enoch*, Schweitzer must be right, and it also and as necessarily follows that Jesus was completely mistaken. He believed that a divine intervention in the world, with Himself as its leader, was about to take place, and it did not. The only possible conclusion is that, as such an expected intervention was entirely God's act, presumably predetermined, He had seriously misconceived the Divine purpose. But if by the term 'Son of Man' Jesus meant, with *Daniel*, 'the people

[3] *Mark* viii, 38. [4] *Mark* viii, 34.

of the Saints of the Most High,' in other words, either the whole Jewish people, or a substantial number of them at last wholly devoted to God, a saving Remnant, the Servant of Jehovah, then the whole complexion of the meaning is altered. Such a saving remnant would have been gathered by His and His apostles' call to repentance grasped, understood and acted upon. It would be God working through men and, as always, so respecting their freedom as to be dependent on their response. There could be no certainty when this would happen. But so far Jesus had gained a great hearing, impressed many people, and been followed by great crowds. It is then natural to take the words, not as a certain prediction but as the hope and even the confident expectation, that His mission, and that of His disciples, would rapidly succeed.

It is rather striking that this is the only place in the earlier part of His ministry where Jesus uses the term Son of Man in its so to say technical sense.[5] But in this case, if it here means 'the people of the saints of the Most High,' it is natural and right. It was spoken in the earlier part of the ministry when Jesus hoped to win the Jewish people. It means 'a widespread and deep-going change of mind can take place in Israel, and it may actually occur before your mission tour is complete.'

There are several passages in the Synoptic Gospels which confirm this conclusion that in the early days Jesus expected to win the whole, or a considerable part, of the Jewish people. The two laments over Jerusalem,[6] besides being strong confirmation of a frequent Judaean ministry, such as is recorded by *John*, shew His keen disappointment in not winning them. The words in the parable of the Vineyard, 'They will reverence my Son,'[7] indicate that Jesus must at first have contemplated a great succes in His mission to Israel. This success, in view of all His teaching of God's attitude to men, and their consequent duty and privilege of a life of trust and obedience, and of all the moral teaching that naturally springs from that root, must have meant that in the early days He had hoped to undertake with them a great mission to the rest of the world, beginning no doubt with the Roman occupying

[5] It is a commonplace of Synoptic criticism that the two occurrences of the term in *Mark* ii probably ought to be taken as simply meaning 'man' or 'someone.' *Matthew* sometimes introduces the term into contexts taken from *Mark* in which it is absent. *Luke* has it twice in early chapters in Q contexts, in one of which it is absent in *Matthew*. The other may be genuine and likewise may be a late saying mistakenly given an earlier setting. There are also some places in *Luke* where it occurs neither in Marcan nor Q contexts. Two of these will be referred to later.

[6] *Luke* xiii, 34, 35 (*Matthew* xxiii, 37-39); *Luke* xix, 41-44.

[7] *Mark* xii, 6.

forces in Judaea, and then extending over the Roman world, as way should open. Under these circumstances the advance of Christianity might have been a very different thing from what it has been. With the strong Jewish background of centuries of Monotheism, accepted, not primarily as an intellectual conclusion reached by the contemplation of the unity of nature, but by moral and religious insight, we might have had a Christian Church far less concerned with the merely intellectual, organizational and ritual aspects of the Faith and far more concerned with its inner core of trust in God and love to men. Thereby it is possible that the disunity of Christendom, now so deeply deplored, might have been avoided. Probably there would have been no Islam. The shameful tale of persecution of the Jews would never have had to be told. The Gospel might not only have reached China when it did, through the Nestorian Church in the seventh century, but have become centuries ago the power, and more than the power, that it is now becoming in that land. In short, the failure of the Jews to respond to the message of Jesus has meant that the whole advance towards the Kingdom of God *on earth* has been incalculably retarded. The Son of Man, the Righteous Remnant, the Servant of God, instead of being the whole nation trained by God for two thousand years for the purpose of being a blessing to all nations of the earth, was now reduced to one man, standing alone, for complete dedication to the Kingdom of God in a hostile or indifferent world. Thenceforth Jesus began to teach that the Son of Man must suffer. Thenceforward He set His face to go towards the Cross.

What I have suggested not only makes sense of a verse in *Matthew* otherwise a problem, it also enables us to see something of what the Cross meant to Jesus. If the great repentance of the Jewish people had taken place, and they with Jesus had become the Son of Man, Jesus might still have had to suffer on the Cross at the hands of the Roman Government, but it would not have been alone and deserted even by His friends, nor would it have been at the instigation of the Jewish authorities. It would probably have been as the first and greatest victim of a general persecution directed against a movement thought to be dangerously strong, and therefore a peril to the State. The terrible contrast between that and what did happen accounts, I believe, for an incident of the Passion narrative which, in view of the quiet and confident courage with which many Christian martyrs have faced a death as horrible as the cross, raises difficulties to some readers. What is the meaning of the Agony in the Garden? We must of course rule out the answer that Jesus was facing the wrath of God

and actually about to bear the punishment of the sins of all men. The God whom He trusted could not treat anyone so. But if the very thing that in the early days seemed essential, the winning of the Jewish people to be the Son of Man, had not happened, and instead the death to which He was going was being engineered by the leaders of that people, and if in addition His companions who for months had been with Him were to fail and flee, and if as a result of all this the future prospect for His own people was dark, and the way of winning the world far longer, more problematical and more full of temporary set-backs, than it would otherwise have been, is not a depth of woe even unto despair understandable? In the Garden courage overcame despair. God's will was the salvation of all men. If that could not be obtained by His life and teaching bringing men to repentance, His death, inevitable if He were not to give up His mission, must be the means of bringing it about. So He went forward to the Cross.

III.

Is there any other New Testament evidence for this idea of the coming of the Son of Man, and of a growing and developing Kingdom of God on earth? Manson again has pointed the way. 'The Son of Man,' the literal translation of the Greek New Testamen phrase '*ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*' is a phrase grammatically impossible both in Hebrew and in Aramaic. Paul knew Greek as his second native language, and would therefore have a feeling for style and expression. Knowing also Aramaic, he would know that *Bar Nasha* simply means man, yet being a Christian he would have known of the use of the term by Jesus; but is there any reason to suppose that the Greek form, '*ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*' as it appears in our Gospels was familiar to him? It is unlikely to have been used by the early Jerusalem Church. They would use the Aramaic form, as apparently they used 'Maran' Lord. Now one of the striking Pauline thoughts is the union of Christians in Christ as His Body and as one man in Him. Is not this the collective Son of Man idea in another form? Manson cites *I Cor.* xv. 45-49 and *Eph.* ii, 13-15 as the relevant passages. As he says, we have in Paul

> 'the same conception of the Son of Man as in the teaching of Jesus, with just that difference which arises from the historic facts of the death of Jesus and the resurrection' (*op. cit.*, p. 234).

May we not go further? Is not *Eph.* iv, 13, 'till we all attain unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto the full-grown man (*ἄνδρα τέλειον*) to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ,' a suggestion of the coming of the Son of Man? The following verses suggest that we are scarcely effec-

tive parts of the Body of Christ by mere conversion, or church membership. We require to grow up into Him, the Head, for there is still too little stability in us, so that at present we are easily swept off our feet by the wiles of error. But making love the reality of our lives produces this growth into Him.[8] That is, I take it, that we only can become part of the Son of Man, understood as the redeeming power of this world, as the love of God transforms us, making love the ruling principle of our lives. This is of course only another way of saying that we are to be wholly loyal to God, completely dedicated to God, precisely what is meant by the people of the saints of the Most High, the Remnant and the Servant.

Paul then, too, has this conception of the Son of Man, and this passage at least suggests the Coming of the Son of Man in something like the sense in which I have been speaking of it, stressing, however, rather the *becoming* than the coming. Has he also the conception of the Kingdom of God on earth? He certainly says in one place that 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God.'[9] But as in this place his subject is the resurrection and the life beyond the grave, it would be perilous to draw from his words any wider conclusion than that obviously intended, namely, that not mortal bodies of flesh and blood, but spiritual bodies of which he has spoken a little earlier, have place in the life to come. On the other hand, *Romans* xiv, 17, 'The Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost,' clearly implies the Kingdom in this world. He makes himself responsible, indeed, in *I* and *II Thess.* for as crude an eschatology as we find in the *Gospel of Matthew*, with the addition of much more definite emphasis on the destruction of evil-doers. But there is reason for thinking that his views on this subject changed greatly in later years. In *Romans* and the Epistles of the Imprisonment there are passages which, if they do not mean final universal salvation, are difficult to assign any meaning to. 'That in the name of Jesus every knee should bow'[10] might perhaps, taken alone, be understandable as the expression of a certainty that some will be unwillingly compelled to bow. But is that really in line with the tone of the passage? And as it continues 'and every tongue shall confess that Jesus is Lord,' that is, that everyone will make the confession of faith that constitutes a Christian, it seems almost certain that he must have been a universalist. The

[8] I take it that 'speaking the truth in love' so feebly represents ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ as practically to minimize its meaning. Do not the words rather mean realizing ourselves in love, or, as I have put it, making love the reality of our lives?

[9] *I Cor.* xv, 50. [10] *Phil.* ii, 10.

first chapter of *Colossians*, especially verse 19, is even more definite: there it is said that through Christ God is going to reconcile all things to Himself, and this is as it were repeated and underlined. In *Romans* viii, 18-24, the same universalism appears, and with it a statement which seems to me to mean a completely redeemed world on this earth, for it says that the creature, or creation, is to be redeemed from corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God. If it be objected, as it sometimes is, that corruption here means simply the decay natural to all living beings, and that therefore the Apostle means the end of this world and the beginning of a heavenly world elsewhere, then I ask why does he select the term creature or creation, which at least suggests this material world? Is it not more likely that he as a Jew went back in mind to *Genesis* i, in which the essential goodness of God's creation of material things is asserted? Does he not rather mean a world re-made into what God originally meant it to be—in other words, the world as really and in fact God's Kingdom?

Paul then has an earlier and a later eschatology, and they are not compatible with one another. The earlier assumes a literal coming of Christ on the clouds of heaven, the rapture of the saints to meet Him, and the destruction of the wicked. It is in line with popular eschatology of the *Enoch* type. The later has as its goal a complete world redemption; it at least leaves room for a long period of development, and seems to posit this in the growth of the individual into Christ, and it at least may also imply the collective idea of the Son of Man. How does this change come about? Paul's own experience of the inner power of Christ must certainly have a place in it, but is it not also possible that at first he had simply accepted the crude eschatology which had been current in some circles of Judaism, which seems to have been taken over by the early Church, and later on had heard more exact and correct reports of what Jesus had actually said, and so arrived at his later view?

The question now arises, how was it that the early Church ever accepted the crude view? I think we can see the first steps to it in the *Acts* reports of Peter's speeches, which are dominated by the idea that Jesus fulfilled the Old Testament prophecy. Already, on the cross, He has fulfilled the prophecy of the Servant of Jahveh, the day of Pentecost fulfils that of the outpouring of the Spirit predicted in *Joel*, but there remain the prophecies of a triumphant conquering King; they are still to be fulfilled. Thus from earliest days the work of Christ was divided into two parts, one already fulfilled, the other to be fulfilled. A literalistic acceptance of the words of Jesus about the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven,

combined with the natural belief that the only thing for the wicked was punishment, no doubt supported by the many words of Jesus about the serious results of rejecting His message, in the general atmosphere of apocalyptic hope, produced the crude eschatology which appears slightly in *Mark*, more definitely in *Matthew*, and perhaps most fully in the *Thessalonian Epistles* and the *Book of Revelation.*

But a tradition still remained of words of Jesus incompatible with much of this. Luke appears to have had some knowledge of it. In any case he both records sayings that are less full of it than are Mark's, and on the important point of the divine punishment of the wicked suggests that what was really said was rather something better interpreted as the natural consequences of sin, and, be it noted, as in Paul's passage on the wrath of God (*Rom.* i), clearly implying consequences in this world.[11] *John* is clearer still in the great passage iii, 16-21. In these verses the main points of popular eschatology are almost explicitly denied. Christ comes not to judge but to save, and no new action is needed in judgment; His coming, which has already taken place, involves it.

IV.

It remains then to point out two things. (1) That the coming of the Son of Man, as I have tried to set it forth, is wholly in line with the quite distinct and unmistakable religious and moral teaching of Jesus. The Father cares for all men, even for the lower creation, therefore the one way of life is to trust in Him. He seeks the lost until He finds it, and waits with infinite patience for the return of the wastrel. The Kingdom is similar to the processes of nature, for it has the same Creator. To accept it requires a complete change of mind, acceptance of God's rule, and obedience relying on His power. As love to all is God's attitude, so human love must be extended to all other men, and its method is doing as you would be done by. This is God's way all through. It is not altered after a time into its opposite, as in the eschatological tradition. The same patient continuance in well-doing must therefore be man's way of co-operating with God.

(2) It must therefore be obvious that this also fits in with our modern ideas of progress, which in some Christian circles it is fashionable to despise and condemn. But progress is only to be made under God's guidance. The life of self-will leads to disaster. That the message of Jesus should be compatible with progress is surely Christian. That idea had its source in the Scriptures, where

[11] *Luke* xiii, 1-9.

in one form or other the thought of God's purpose is strongly emphasised.

Lastly, a word or two must be said about how this idea of the Son of Man will work out in practice. It will not do to regard the *whole Christian Church* as itself equivalent to the Son of Man. Jesus found that the Jewish people as a whole did not rise to the ideal. Has He not repeatedly found the same failure in the Christian Church? It seems to me that the Son of Man comes in a real sense when a considerable body of Christian people by their lives and words based upon a deep and genuine devotion to God, become manifestly a witness to Christ. This was the case in the early Church. There have been long periods when that witness has been so weak and scattered as to be almost ineffective. Yet from time to time, as for instance in the Franciscan movement, the Quaker movement, the Evangelical revival, and at other times, something of the same sort has happened. But the great coming still waits. What does it wait for? Surely the willingness of the rest of the Church and mankind to see, recognize and accept it and, committing themselves to God, work with Him. Two strange sayings recorded only by *Luke* seem to indicate circumstances of just this sort. 'The days come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man and shall not see it'[12] fits the many periods of barrenness. 'When the Son of Man cometh shall he find faith on the earth?'[13] suggests exactly what happened in each of the three comings above suggested. Great good was done, but in no case was the Church generally ready. The faith was absent, and that opportunity passed. Some time the Son of Man will come again in a small nucleus and there will be such a response of faith that the whole world may be changed. The outward circumstances to-day are in some ways more propitious for such a coming than ever before. If this paper leads some Christians to pray more intelligently 'Thy Kingdom come,' it will have been worth while.

[12] *Luke* xvii, 22.

[13] *Luke* xviii, 8.

THE RELIGION OF THE LIBERAL MIND: MODERNIST AND HUMANIST

By T. Wigley, M.A., Chairman of the Union of Modern Free Churchmen.

THERE is a phrase which is rightly often on the lips of modernist Christians. It is the phrase, 'The here and now.' By it we do not imply that it is possible or desirable to cut ourselves off from the past, to which indeed we owe so much, since the history of the modernist mind stretches far back into distant days. We venerate, as much as the writer of the letter to the Hebrews, 'men who by faith conquered kingdoms, obtained promises, shut the mouths of lions, and from weakness won to strength.' These men, alive and responsive to the divine truth, beauty and goodness, which sought expression in their day in their minds and life, are our continuing inspiration. From their seed, planted at cost in the lonely furrows of the world, has come that harvest of the Spirit which includes not only peace, good temper and kindliness, but fidelity to the light, freedom from prejudice, narrow-mindedness and partisanship. We do them reverence not by erecting monuments to their bones, but by making sure that the spirit which animated them in their day still moves us in our here and now. Circumstances change: thought and its forms change: knowledge grows in all directions; but in every age there remains the need for a faith that enquires and affirms, and a faith which does not express itself in both these ways will cease to have any influence in the world. We live by our affirmations, but in days when slogans are bellowed into thoughtless ears and prejudices are declared to be principles, it is well to remind ourselves and others that catchwords can never take the place of critical thinking, and that there is such a thing, in Ruskin's words, as 'the conscience of an ass.' We have suffered too long from the braying of ignorance in morals as well as in religion, and it is time that those who refuse to grow up by leaving the infantile behind them realized that they are neurotic rather than childlike.

> 'People wish to be settled,' said Emerson; 'only as far as they are unsettled is there any hope for them. . . . Beware when the great God lets loose a thinker on this planet.'

All too frequently men have shown their fear of the thinker by burning him at the stake, by offering him the poison cup, or by

nailing him to a cross. Fortunately truth breaks out from its tomb, and a later generation learns to reverence what was previously gibbeted and rejected.

The age in which we are living is one whose opportunity is as great as its need. I have little patience with those whose response to the opportunity which need presents is either a retreat to some haven of imagined security in the past, or a projection of their dreams into some fantastic future heaven. We are concerned with the here and now. The situation is serious but not gloomy, impressive but not depressive. It is a day which the Lord hath made, let us at least do our best to rejoice and be glad in it. We shall help no one by our groans, or even by our apologies or regrets. When 'the vile blows and buffets of the world have so incens'd,' or we are 'so weary with disasters, tugg'd with fortune,' that we can see no good in anything, we are encouraging a mood which will have as fatal consequences as that of the murderers in *Macbeth*. Let us banish from our vocabulary the word 'failure.' We have heard it all too often in connexion with every aspect and institution of men's lives from religion to politics; and now in certain quarters, with a logic gone mad, we are informed that man himself is a failure, that we can hope for nothing from man, who at his best is a poor worm and at his worst a devil. This is all very depressing, if we take it seriously. Fortunately there is no need to do so, for even in our modern world faith, hope and love abide, and, dare I add, intelligence. The presence of these qualities, embodied in the common man and woman, will be more than a match for the most threatening barbarization, and they will, I believe, express themselves in a venture of thoughtful religion in which the seemingly irreconcilable interests of man's life will be harmonized. From such a harmonious whole of right thinking, feeling and willing, we may expect to emerge the insights which we need and crave. If truth and reality is one from whatever the angle we approach it, then with good heart and clear mind we can set ourselves to the task of proving for ourselves the truth of the ancient saying, 'Ye shall seek me and find me when ye shall search for me with all your heart.'

Our enemy is the divided mind: it is a sick mind, and it is caused not so much by the inevitable specializations of our day, as by the departmentalizing of our selves and interests; too easily we are apt to lose consciousness of the larger unity which embraces all. In view of the variety and number of the facts significant for religious thought, to say nothing of the diverse methods of approach to reality in all its many-sidedness, we cannot therefore

expect to-day any individual to attempt the work of an Aquinas. What we can expect is a gain here and a gain there with a gradually emerging pattern of a religious philosophy to which many specialities have made their contributions, the distillation of the experiences of many individuals. Something like this happened in the work of the Dominicans with their nunneries on the upper Rhine during the later Middle Ages when, according to G. G. Coulton, two important events took place — the Dominicans in instructing their nuns had to translate the tradition of the Church out of Latin into the common speech in order to make it communicable, and in this process of communication the nuns modified the tradition in the direction of experiential reality. From this the mystical theology which was to have a profound effect on the later Reformers had its birth. It is from such interpenetrating of knowledge and life that religion maintains itself in every age, and our own will be no exception to the rule. We must not expect any sudden transformation by the rubbing of some ancient lamp, or even from the substitution of new lamps for old.

What is, I think, of primary importance is the cultivation and encouragement of the liberal mind, that an increasing number of people shall possess in their minds what Milton called that 'true Libertie which always with right Reason dwells.' Milton says that when a man forsakes the rule of Reason and loses his inward liberty, then it is easy for a Tyrant to take away his outward liberties as well. The first fetters are always on the mind of man, and, if not self-imposed, they are at least in the beginning agreed to by the victim who has surrendered in his mind; the grim practical results follow inevitably from this first surrender. I am reminded of a conversation which Gilbert Murray once had with John Morley, in the course of which Morley told him how Mr. Gladstone used to ask about people who, as far as votes went, were his undoubted followers, 'Is he a man of real Liberality?' The question is an important one, and extends far beyond the range of political parties. The word *liber* means a free man, the adjective *liberalis* means having the quality of a free man. It is possible to be technically free oneself, and yet not possess that quality which is to be seen most clearly in its application to other people. Did not a slave-owner exclaim, 'Give me Liberty or give me death'? Murray stresses a characteristic of Liberality which is of such fundamental importance that I quote his own words:

> 'A free man must obviously be able to think freely. If he is deliberately harnessed in blinkers or forced into a particular groove from which he cannot escape, he is not like a free man, not *liberalis*. And in order to think freely he must have freedom of speech. . . . The thoughts of a

> man who never expresses himself and never listens to other men cannot remain healthy or normal. . . . To deny the right of free speech results in a denial of free thought; and to be denied the power of thinking is the direst slavery' (*Liberality and Civilization,* p. 21).

That is well spoken, and we who are modernists can claim that in the past and in the present we have sought to manifest real liberality of mind; it is the essential condition of civilization and any genuine and true religion; indeed liberty exists to promote these very ends, it is the voice which cries even in the desert, 'Make the way ready for the Lord, level the paths for him.' To proclaim release for captives and recovery of sight for the blind, to set free the oppressed, in the widest sense of those familiar words, is good news with which no group need be ashamed to be identified.

Our modernist expression of religion springs naturally from this liberality of mind. We are not able, even if we so desired, to dispense with what A. N. Whitehead calls 'the trappings of religion,' its rites, ceremonies and rituals, its embodiments in organization. But we stress what we claim is the heart of the matter, the spirit of reverence, the need to make the spiritual real, the discovery and appropriation of God as our own experience in the here and now. Even the earthen vessel may become exalted in its humility by the treasure which it bears, and the material made the vehicle of the spiritual and share in a measure in its nature. 'I do not go to the woods to get my dinner,' said Thoreau, 'but to get the sustenance which dinners only preserve me to enjoy.' If we thus find ourselves at home in the world of nature as the expression of mind and spirit, even more consciously is the experience ours in our world of intersubjective intercourse in which our minds have been nursed. The highest in the order of Nature is personal, and if that is so, then it is within the realm of personality that God, the spiritual, will be most clearly revealed. We may be grateful to John Macmurray for his insistence on the fact that it is out of this universal practical problem of human relationships that religion arises, as science arises out of the practical problem of our relation to the material world. Religion is about community, and in a striking sentence Macmurray says:

> 'People without reverence are blind; they do not understand the nature of things, and so they destroy themselves.'

We begin to be convinced that there is something in the nature of things which will render intelligible all its diversity, give our little hours a timeless value, and add to personal loveliness an eternal grace. We move, still on the ground of experience, from quantitative measurement to qualitative discernment; in a word, we become more personal, and in such community within community we

grow. We do not need to be poets to know something of 'infinite passion, and the pain of finite hearts that yearn,' or to appreciate Mrs. Browning's exquisite *Sonnets from the Portuguese* and her description how

> 'The face of all the world is changed, I think,
> Since first I heard the footsteps of thy soul . . .'

Such personal history has, I would contend, something more authentic to say to us about the nature of reality than anything which may happen in a test-tube, or in an assembly of ecclesiastics. What better words can we find to describe it than 'the Realm of God'?

So we come to the supreme issue of our day, God. Now belief in God is a very different thing from belief in *a* God. God is not 'a person,' for in Him are all persons, parts of that process of Becoming, which is a phase of Being. Of this we have at least a dim awareness in ourselves in so far as we transcend ourselves and enter more fully into relations with other selves, attaining what we call perfection in fellowship. If this is the characteristic of personality, then God must be the supreme Person, creative and indwelling all that is in varying degrees. He is at work in the here and now as certainly as in any there and then; and if our eyes are blinded that we cannot see Him in the present time, we shall look in vain for signs of His presence in the records of an ancient past. If there is no divine spirit in modern man, then God, if He exists, can never be known by modern man, and that would be the end of more than religion. We are on more certain ground both scientific and religious when we say, with Professor J. Y. Simpson:

> 'Nature was antecendent to man's mind: she brought him forth, and it is to her many-sided beckonings — of some of which he in the end speaks as "revelation," though this is true in varying degrees of them all — that he responds. Religion is the supreme form of that adaptation which is life. True personality in man, his spiritual nature, like every other element in his make-up, is a direct responsive adaptation, in this case, to that which is Ultimate in his environment' (*Nature: Cosmic, Human and Divine*, p. 127 *f.*).

The process is always an active one, for only as we tread the way do we approach the goal, God seeking incarnation in each one of us as life-giving Spirit.

Along this way our fellow-travellers may not speak our language or find our symbols best express their thought, but the mind which is really liberal will not deny them the right of way, since none of us can claim finality in apprehension or expression. When, for instance, so distinguished a scholar and humanist as Gilbert Murray is our companion for a long stretch of the way, and in conversation tells us that some of his friends

> 'are agnostics because they are vividly conscious of the great Mystery; they are sceptics because they care much for truth in a region where most people do not care, and they will not claim to know what they cannot know' (*Myths and Ethics*, p. 27),

are we to call down fire to consume him because he cannot use the conventional religious passwords? Is this to be the Christian response to those who are as honest and often more humble than some who profess to be Christian?

> 'I am not a Christian,' says Murray; 'in a broad sense we are, I think, in agreement about the precious quality of Christian civilization; . . . in practice that agreement carries us pretty far. . . . But that is by no means all. . . . The society and the Churches that are historically Christian are at heart not so. The saints would condemn them. In such cases we and the real Christians find ourselves together. . . . Where, then, does the difference come? Simply in the reasons which we give for believing that this faith is right, that the actions to which it points are what we call "good." . . . It is the myth that divides us; and it divides us only when people take phrases that are originally and essentially metaphorical and insist on turning them into dogmas. . . . Is this attitude too remote and exotic for the plain man? I think not. It is very close to that of the famous Broad Churchmen of my youth, such as Jowett and F. D. Maurice, and to that of the Modernists' (*op. cit.*, p. 28 *f.*).

What is our reply as modernists to be to such a wayfarer? The anathemas of an assumed omniscience, or, in Cromwell's words, 'To be a seeker is to be of the best sect next to a finder. Happy seeker, happy finder'? We are all seekers, and we are all finders according to our spiritual capacity. We may not each find the same treasure; it is enough if it stirs us to further search along the way of the Spirit where discovery and revelation are one, and to possess is to find ourselves possessed at last by One inadequately described by any words, yet known in 'exultations, agonies, and love, and man's unconquerable mind.'

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN'S BRAINS TRUST

WE are grateful to those readers who have sent questions for consideration by the members of the Modern Churchman's Brains Trust. From these questions we have selected four which are discussed below. The membership of the Brains Trust is not fixed, but will vary from 'session' to 'session.' We are much indebted to those who have helped us on this occasion. Questions should be written as briefly as possible on a postcard addressed to The M.C. Brains Trust, The Vicarage, Stithians, Truro, Cornwall, and sent in as early as possible.

Question I.

In view of the fact that in the Old Testament the Fall of Man is mentioned only in the legendary account of Creation of the second and third chapters of Genesis, while the only reference to it in the New Testament occurs in the writings of St. Paul, does it not follow that the doctrine of Original Sin depends entirely on the teaching of St. Paul, which is itself based on his acceptance of what is now known to be only a legend?

It all depends what you mean by 'Original Sin.' If you mean merely that all human beings, in a greater or less degree, are sinful, it is clear that your conclusion is soundly based upon observation of human life as well as upon the general teaching of the Bible. It is a matter of common experience that we all have our faults, and this experience is supported by Freudian psychology and by the occurrence of the wars which have marred the present century.

But many who have spoken and written about Original Sin mean also that we are wholly evil. This is nonsense; it does not square with the goodness displayed by so many human beings during the recent war; it disregards the Biblical teaching that we are 'made in God's image.' If we are wholly evil, and can do nothing to make ourselves better, why did Christ call on us to repent?

It is equally wrong to imagine that there is anything sinful about normal conception and birth, or that man is essentially sinful for the imagined reason that procreation is evil. This error is based on a misunderstanding of *Psalm* li, 5, 'Behold, I was shapen in wickedness: and in sin hath my mother conceived me.' D. E. H. Whiteley.

The dogma of Original Sin that owing to the sin of Adam and Eve all their descendants inherited their guilt and so became liable to everlasting damnation would seem to have been held by St. Paul (it certainly was held by St. Augustine) and was derived from a primitive myth. Jesus Christ did not hold this doctrine, and His commendation of little children as heirs of the Kingdom of Heaven indicates that he thought of human nature as essentially good. Although Jesus condemns many kinds of actual sin He nowhere condemns original sin. It is probable that St. Paul derived his doctrine of original sin not only from the Garden of Eden legend but also from the rabbinical doctrine of the evil tendency in man's nature, which makes it easier for man to do evil than to do good. St. Paul had this experience. 'O,

wretched man that I am' (*Romans* vii, 24). Modern man regards this tendency as due to our brute heredity. Bishop Butler holds that there is no natural impulse which is inherently bad. It is the misuse of natural impulses which makes them bad. H. D. A. Major.

The doctrine is legend in so far as it depends on the belief that *Genesis*, chapters ii and iii, state historical fact. It is also legend in supposing that if Adam had not sinned he and all mankind would have been immortal. But the doctrine is true in declaring that there is a fundamental tendency to evil in human nature. Niebuhr, in his Gifford Lectures, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, sketches a doctrine of original sin along these lines. He says that, through lack of faith, man gives himself to the service of himself, when he ought to give himself to the service of God. Original Sin is selfishness, caused by lack of faith in God. J. K. Nettlefold.

The doctrine of Original Sin has been characterized as the only Christian doctrine for which there is contemporary evidence; but all that the evidence really proves is that human nature is imperfect. As a matter of historic fact the doctrine would never have attained its present high ecclesiastical prestige but for the fact that it supported, and was designed to support, ecclesiastical vested interests. The correlative of Original Sin is Salvation by ecclesiastical means, *i.e.* by priests, sacraments, and the Church. J. C. Hardwick.

Question II.

A well-known carol contains the lines:

'Lo, within a manger lies
He who built the starry skies.'

Is the doctrine implied in this statement orthodox or otherwise?

The doctrine is unorthodox. He 'who built the starry skies' is God the Word before the Incarnation. 'In the beginning was the Word. . . All things were made by him' (*John* i, 1 and 2). This was ages before 'the Word was made flesh,' was united in one person with the human Jesus. This one person is the God-Man, in whom both the divine and human natures were perfect, meaning complete, according to the *Quicunque Vult*, which speaks of the human nature as 'subsisting of a reasonable soul and human flesh.'

It is therefore orthodox to assert that Jesus Christ, the God-Man, had completely human will, understanding, and feelings. This is clear from a careful study of the Gospels, particularly St. Mark's. Orthodoxy does not attempt to explain the interaction of the human and divine natures in the single person. It is inclined to call it a mystery. This is safe, and in part wise, since the inner soul of every man is a mystery to others, more or less obscure to the man himself, and known completely only to God. A fruitful way of approaching the mystery in Jesus Christ is to represent Him as always understanding God's will for Him, and, in spite of temptation, obeying it.

J. K. Nettlefold.

It is as well to remember, when discussing orthodox and heterodox Christology the late Dr. William Temple's dictum in *Foundations* that 'the formula of Chalcedon is, in fact, a confession of the bankruptcy of Greek Theology.'

G. L. H. Harvey.

The world was made not by Jesus Christ, but by the 'creative power' or 'Word' of God. Yet, if we want to know the nature of the God Who made the world, we must turn our eyes to Jesus Christ. The man Jesus was such that He was called 'the Word made flesh.' St. John's instinct did not mis-

lead him when he put into our Lord's mouth the words 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' D. E. H. WHITELEY.

This is the language of devotion, not of dogma. Poetical pietism is allowed a freedom not granted to conciliar decrees. Technically the statement is heretical. Orthodoxy teaches that the Creator's agent in creation is the Divine Wisdom, or Word of God. The human personality (manhood) of Jesus did not exist before the Incarnation. Hence the human personality of Jesus could not have created the stars, which were created before the Word was made flesh. Cf. *John* i, 3, 'All things were made by Him' (the Word) with *John* i, 14, 'The Word became flesh and dwelt among us.' We may note that Jesus Christ nowhere claims in the Gospels to have created the heavens and the earth. H. D. A. MAJOR.

The doctrine expressed in the hymn is comprehensible but incredible. On the other hand, the doctrine of creation by the Word may be comprehensible to scholars (whether credible or not to them it would be hard to say, since they do not tell us), but is both incomprehensible and incredible to the average man — if to disbelieve what you do not understand is not a contradiction in terms. To the ordinary man the idea of a personified Wisdom is nonsense. If the doctrine of the Incarnation is to survive it needs re-presentation in terms that are at once comprehensible and credible. J. C. HARDWICK.

QUESTION III.

It has been stated that Modern Churchmen do not believe in 'the expiatory sacrifice of Jesus on the Cross.' If this be so, what do they understand by the doctrine of Atonement?

Although Modern Churchmen reject the view that by His death on the Cross Jesus Christ offered an expiatory sacrifice to the Divine Father for the sins of the world, as morally and theologically unsound, yet they are convinced that 'God was in Christ reconciling the World unto Himself.' This atoning work was accomplished by Jesus unveiling in His Gospel, character, and spirit, the true Nature of God — by which the children of God are drawn to Him in penitence and love. The Parable of the Prodigal Son is the profoundest exposition of the Atonement for Modern Churchmen.

> '. . . even so there shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety-and-nine righteous persons, which need no repentance' (*Luke* xv, 7).

The atoning work, initiated and exemplified in the Ministry of Jesus, is carried on by all true Christians — those 'many Christs' of whom Origen wrote — whose own atoning lives help to bring their fellow-men into communion with the Divine Father. Hence we find St. Paul writing of his own missionary work as a filling up of that which was *lacking* in the tribulations of Christ (*Col.* i, 24).

Dr. Rashdall's Bampton Lectures, *The Idea of the Atonement,* should be consulted by all who wish to understand the reasons for the Modern Churchman's interpretation of this doctrine. H. D. A. MAJOR.

Dr. Major supplies us with a rational and moral interpretation of the Atonement, and this will satisfy those whose make-up is predominantly rational and moral. We have to realise, however, that the people among whom the idea grew up were neither rational nor moral in our sense, and that their mentality was different from ours. The sources of the doctrine's appeal were primarily emotional, and the doctrine itself is closely bound up with the religious idea of sin as defilement. Whether we can any longer hold the

traditional doctrine seems doubtful, though we have to admit that nothing we can put in its place will have the same strong emotional appeal as the view that 'Christ died for our sins.' J. C. HARDWICK.

The Abelardian doctrine of the Atonement does not prohibit our saying that 'Christ died for our sins,' but it does prohibit our saying that Christ died for our sins as a propitiatory sacrifice. H. D. A. MAJOR.

Christ did die for our sins; but He did not die to appease the wrath of an angry God; to say this would be blasphemy, and hardly anyone does in fact support so crude a theory. If a man dives into a canal to rescue a child and dies from pneumonia as a result, he has died to save that child. In the same way Christ lived on earth in order to give us a new knowledge of God and a new power without which it would have been impossible for us to be reconciled to God. Inevitably He came into conflict with the powers of evil, and His death was the result.

God does not love us because Christ died for us. Christ died for us because 'God so loved the world . . .' Christ did not die to make God loving; 'He died to make us good.' D. E. H. WHITELEY.

If the child whom the man rescued had disobeyed its mother's commandment to keep away from the canal, then the man 'died for the sin' of the child as well as for the child's rescue. H. D. A. MAJOR.

For me the doctrine of the Atonement is the same as the doctrine of the Incarnation. Christ lived and died in order to reconcile mankind to God. His death is the most striking expression of the spirit in which He lived, the perfect completion of His life's work. But His death did not achieve something different from what His life had done. His life and His death are one, and do the same work, the reconcilement of mankind to God.

J. K. NETTLEFOLD.

QUESTION IV.

Is it not a fact that the discoveries of science are all on the material plane? Can you name any one of such discoveries which helps us to love our neighbours as ourselves? If not, what is the good of them?

It is not true that 'the discoveries of science are all on the material plane,' for the subject-matter of the different sciences varies. Physics and Chemistry may deal wholly with 'the material plane,' but it is doubtful if this is the case with Biology, and certainly is not so with the comparatively new sciences of Psychology and Sociology. Biology deals with the living organism, which would seem to be something other than a complex constellation of material particles. Psychology deals with mind and the behaviour of animals and men; while Sociology deals with the relationships of men with one another. Minds and relationships are not material entities.

Discoveries in Physics and Chemistry may not help us to love our neighbour, but they do enable us to implement that love and make it effective.

Discoveries in Psychology do actually help us to love our neighbour inasmuch as this science enables us to understand the real causes of selfish feeling and behaviour in ourselves, and thus how to eliminate them. If hate and envy predominate in our make-up rather than love, Psychology can probably tell us why, and can enable us to educate our emotions along better lines.

As for Sociology, the science of human relationships, this should enable us to understand not only what are the best kinds of relationship between men, but how to develop and preserve these. This science teaches us what are the conditions most likely to promote mutual love between neighbours.

J. C. HARDWICK.

Many of the discoveries of science are not entirely on the material plane, *e.g.* those of Anthropology. These teach us a great deal about primitive man, his religion and morals. These discoveries have shown us much of the important and helpful contributions made by religion and morals to human welfare and progress. Even such a purely physical science as Astronomy can do much to enlarge the mind of man and develop in him the grace of humility and reverence. 'When I consider the heavens, the work of thy fingers' (*Psalm* viii).

Even if all the discoveries of science were on the material plane they would not be without value for morals and religion. Such discoveries do contribute in many cases to the physical welfare of mankind, and physical welfare is an important factor in human well-being and development. As John Stuart Mill pointed out, the accumulation of material wealth provides for the development of the higher side of civilization.

The physical, mental, moral and spiritual are all closely interwoven in human nature, and we cannot shut them up into water-tight compartments. 'Sir,' said Dr. Johnson, 'if a man will not think of his belly he will think of nothing else.' H. D. A. Major.

The scientific study of soils and of plant life has now made it possible to grow enough food in the world to feed all mankind adequately, under normal conditions. These discoveries make it possible for statesmen to see that no one dies of starvation. Up till the present age there has never been enough food to satisfy everyone.

Modern psychology has shown that man's social instinct is as fundamental as his instinct for self-preservation (see Trotter, *The Herd Instinct in Peace and War*). This provides a much better natural foundation for 'loving our neighbours as ourselves' than the enlightened self-interest recommended, for instance by Bishop Butler. J. K. Nettlefold.

It is harder to love our neighbours if we are physically ill or starving. Advances in medicine and in scientific agriculture enable us to conquer these evils. D. E. H. Whiteley.

Men of all ages seek to interpret or express spiritual truth as they apprehend it in terms of the current notions of their own time. It was therefore not remarkable that the death of Jesus was interpreted in terms of the sacrificial system of the Temple, and that the legend of the Fall of Man in Eden played a part in the formulation of a theological doctrine of sin. Jesus Himself was in the prophetic rather than the priestly line, and showed little interest in the Temple cultus. Nor did He concern Himself with Sin in the abstract. In the Synoptic Gospels He frequently refers to concrete sin or sins, but even then almost always in connection with forgiveness. It is therefore not surprising that the theological development of the doctrines of Atonement and Original Sin was along lines far from consonant with our Lord's own teaching about God and man.

A carol is the exuberant product of folk-imagination, and is therefore unlikely to remain within the confines of theological correctitude. It is a more serious matter that hymns also should

transgress, as they frequently do. Perhaps it is inevitable that emotion should sometimes express itself in a form which intellectually is questionable or objectionable.

Truth, whether scientific, historical or religious, is ultimately one, proceeding as it does from the One God. Whether he knows it or not, the scientist who seeks truth for truth's sake is, in his own sphere of activity, thereby serving God. This being so, the question of the utility of his search is assuredly not primary, though, naturally, we may properly hope to turn some of the knowledge he wins to utilitarian ends. G. L. H. HARVEY.

BOOK REVIEWS

A PRESENT-DAY PROPHET

For over a quarter of a century the name of Karl Barth has been known far beyond the boundaries of Switzerland, his native country. He has combined the offices of prophet and theologian, and though one may distrust his theology, one may yet on occasion hear the authentic prophetic note in his utterances. Early in 1945, when the collapse of the German colossus was plainly imminent Barth addressed himself to his own people, the Swiss, on their proper relationship as Christians to their German neighbours* He spoke as a prophet conscious that he was under compulsion to deliver his message. He spoke as a Christian leader, himself seeking the path the Christian ought to tread through the uncertainties of a mist-enshrouded future.

Barth has never been mealy-mouthed. He approves the 'deep repugnance and repudiation' which to-day mark the attitude of his fellow-countrymen towards Germany. He goes further still. He extends his condemnation to the older Germany which was the precursor of National Socialist Germany and prepared the way for the horrors it has inflicted on the world. National Socialism has but developed, with little deviation, the pattern created by Bismarck. 'The achievement of Frederick the Great and Bismarck could not be brought to a more logical conclusion nor to more complete destruction than it has been done by Adolf Hitler.' That Germany has collapsed in ruin is due to no merely temporary aberration.

What then of the future? Much depends on whether the Germans come to understand the character of the judgment which has descended on them in catastrophe. But will they understand?

> 'We have to reckon with the possibility that the great majority of Germans even now scarcely realize in what a collective madness they have lived so long, and with what deep-seated and justifiable consternation Germany is regarded, what a responsibility they assumed when they supported first Bismarck, then Wilhelm II, and last of all Adolf Hitler, and willingly and patiently did all they were told; and that especially they have no inkling of the horror and loathing with which the German race has been surrounded in the last twelve years. It will be difficult to persuade them even to see the facts and to admit them.'

Barth thinks that the fall of Germany should inspire in the beholder something of the same feeling which he reads into the so-called song of triumph over fallen Babylon in the fourteenth chapter of *Isaiah*.

* *The Germans and Aurelius*, by Karl Barth, translated by R. G. Smith. (Nisbet & Co. Ltd. Price 2/6. 1945.)

'How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!'

He reads into these familiar words triumph, but a triumph 'veiled by a deep sympathy with what is described, by a deep awe which at the same time helps him who has been striken down, who from such a height has fallen so low.'

Various theories purport to explain the emergence of National Socialism. Some observers regard it as an explosive outbreak of primitive savagery through the crust of a superficial civilization. Others regard it as the poison bloom of the passion for authority and subordination. Others trace it to economic causes. They think that fear of the proletariat led the German capitalists to equip Hitler as their *condottiere* with the result that in the end he controlled those who thought to be his masters. The Germans themselves ascribe it to a baleful fate which doomed their nation to emerge at too late a period to secure the living-space in Europe which was properly the due of their high qualities. That shrewd old Frenchman Clemenceau concluded from his long experience of Germany and the Germans that they were cursed by a masochistic element in their make-up. They have, he wrote to a friend,

> 'a sickly and satanic love of death.' 'These people love death. These people cherish a divinity on whom they look with trembling and yet with a smiling ecstasy which renders them completely unbalanced. And this God is death . . . The German adores war out of self-love and because at its end there is the assurance of carnage. War is a contract with death. The German meets death as if it were the mistress dearest to his heart.'

Barth believes that all these theories, though open to question, contain much that is worthy of notice and reflection. At any rate their variety testifies to the complexity of the German problem.

Then Barth turns on his own people and, in no uncertain tones, exhorts them to consider seriously where they themselves stand. He imagines a German challenging the right of the Swiss to sit in judgment on Germany. Far from condemning the principles of National Socialism in its palmy days, they were positively eager to take the most favourable view of it they could. What they condoned when National Socialism flourished they only condemn when it has fallen on evil days.

> 'From 1933 onwards,' he says, 'and until very recently, you have laid the greatest emphasis on maintaining not only correct, but actually friendly relations — not with the German people, but with the Hitler régime. You were in the greatest haste to acknowledge *de jure* — mark well, *de jure* — the misdeeds of our Hitler's boon companions, Franco and Mussolini. You looked askance on the fugitive opponents of the Hitler régime; at that time you wanted to know very little about international democratic solidarity. And in 1938, at the time of Munich, you preached sermons which one can still read, that it was God's Holy Spirit which at that time guided and upheld the statesmen and made them strong (mark well, "strong") for their "struggle for peace" and for heavy and painful sacrifices (namely, the surrender of Czechoslovakia).'

He also points out that during the greater part of the War the Swiss, trembling for their own safety, played at impartiality and washed their hands in innocency. They even, on occasion, when the Germans seemed to hold a position of mastery, rendered them help in ways which he enumerates. What right then have such people, when the position is altered, to dare to sit in judgment on the Germans?

> 'About where Chamberlain's government stood in the time of Munich,' he says, 'about where the Vatican stood, about where the American isolationists stood till 1941, we have seen you standing the whole time.'

Barth, though he adduces some points in mitigation, confesses that he would be hard put to it to give a complete reply to this *gravamen* against his people. At the same time he believes that at heart they were sound, that 'in the last resort the mass of our people and our army knew where they were, even when they did not dare to say it or let it be said aloud.' In any case the Swiss is, even in the literal geographical sense neighbour to the German, and owes him whatever is due from the Christian to his neighbour. Barth is quite emphatic that condonation of evil is no part of the Christian duty. But it is the fact that 'life, including our life with our German neighbours, must go on; it will go on, and it will go on from the point where we now confront them.'

Even German refugees, Barth thinks, have not quite realized that Germany has reached its absolute zero, 'that with the passing of the sign of the swastika, the German eagle will also pass.' Whatever be the immediate shape of things to come the new Germany will be a land full of sadness, and the part it will have to play will be modest and painful.

> 'This time even the memory of the valour of the German Army—doubtless proved anew—will not be able to bring this war retrospectively into a transfiguring light. This time no romantically inspired youth will wander with guitar and song through the German countryside as though nothing had happened, to be changed by sleight of hand into another dangerous warrior horde. This time the German burglar, the German professor and the German student will not so quickly find their way back to the old paths. This time the finest German efficiency and eloquence will be unable to bluff the world again, and so quickly.'

Barth, writing before the War had ended, speculates on the possibility that in Germany there is a considerable number of Germans who are radically opposed to the Nazi system and its principles. He himself believed that there are many such. Unhappily so far there has been very little evidence of their existence, though one might have expected them to emerge during the months which have elapsed since the final defeat. However that may be, he thinks that the very hopelessness of the situation of the Germans is a ground for hope. It is certainly a ground for the pity and sympathy of their neighbours. Barth throughout is deeply conscious of the acute tension under present circumstances between Christian love and Christian moral judgment. At any sign of retrogression the Christian must be as hard as iron. 'We could not help them to escape the expiation and restitution and complete reorientation that are now necessary.' Even in our relationship with the Churches he is conscious of the existence of this tension.

> 'You may often hear it said, in connection with the appeal for the distressed churches abroad, that we shall have to help them in accordance with their wishes. True enough; but we shall for heaven's sake not have to help the German churches to be built up again in the style and spirit they have had till now. In sincere friendship we cannot do that, precisely because we know that the old Germany is lost—and the Church authorities and the theological faculties have played so far a fateful role in this old Germany.'

Barth can speak with knowledge of the Church authorities and theological faculties of Germany seeing that he occupied in Germany a University chair in the faculty of theology during the period of the rise of Hitler to power and for some time afterwards.

Barth believes that because the Germans are definitely down and out they may be more accessible to the call of Christ. His earnest desire is that this call should come to them through the medium of their Swiss neighbours. They have their chance just because they are weary, heavy laden and outcast. 'Come unto me,' he hears Christ saying to them.

'Come unto me, you unlikeable ones, you wicked Hitler boys and girls, you brutal S.S. soldiers, you evil Gestapo police, you sad compromisers and collaborationists, all you men of the herd who have moved so long in patient stupidity behind your so-called leader. Come unto me, you guilty and you accomplices, who now obtain your deserts, as you were bound to do. Come unto me, I know you well, but I do not ask who you are and what you have done, I see only that you have reached the end and must start afresh for good or ill; I will refresh you, I will start from zero with you.'

Will the Germans as they begin to recover from the numb despair of total defeat give ear to a summons of this nature? Not, Barth is confident, if it comes to them through the agency of men tainted with Pharisaism. Nor, does he think, will they be amenable to attempts from outside to re-educate them.

'The Germans, however bad their state, will retreat into themselves, like an oyster into its shell, before all who approach them as teachers, and German youth will defend itself against them tooth and nail . . . What the Germans need is friends; real friends, and not such friends as Job had.'

It is impossible within the compass of a review to do justice to Barth's little book. Barth assuredly is no prophet of smooth things; but his book expresses the considered and informed judgment of a man who has exceptional knowledge of Germany and the Germans, and shows an acute sensitivity to the more subtle elements of a highly complicated situation. He addresses himself to his compatriots; but he himself belongs at least as much to Europe as to Switzerland, and it will be well if his message reaches the ears of many far beyond the boundaries of his home-land.

G. L. H. Harvey

THE GREY SHRINES OF ENGLAND*

For those whose ideal of travel in England is not to cover the greatest distance in the shortest time but to explore historically and aesthetically a carefully selected neighbourhood, Mr. Arthur Grant's *Grey Shrines of England* will provide happy suggestions and sound advice.

Mr. Grant's ideal of travel seems to be to make use of public conveyances for the long distances and his own legs for the short ones, and then to tread the byways rather than the highways. As a consequence, the traveller is brought into contact with much beauty which is never beheld by the profane crowd:

'They glance, they nod, they bustle by.
They never once possess their souls before they die.'

Mr. Grant's method of planning tours is to select a locality identified with some historic personality, as for instance Tennyson, Lord Byron, the 'judicious' Hooker, King Arthur, Charles Lamb and Archbishop Leighton. Possessing a keen appreciation of nature, a wide knowledge of English literature, deep reverence of the sacred, and a quiet sense of humour, we learn from our author's volume facts which surprise us. 'Many tower'd Camelot' is not a poetic fancy but can be identified geographically; Archbishop Leighton, the saintliest of Scottish Prelates, who wrote: 'The heart of man is a barren soil until it be watered by the Grace of God,' resigned the Archbishopric of Glasgow and spent the later years of his life in retirement in the south of England; Alfred Tennyson, who was engaged for twenty years before his financial situation allowed him to marry, was then married before the wedding cake and

* Published by Chambers Ltd., Edinburgh. 7/6.

bridal dresses arrived but stated that 'it was the nicest wedding he had ever attended'; Lord Byron's admirers hoped to have him buried in Westminster Abbey, but our English Childe Harold, who had written to John Murray:

> 'I am sure my bones would not rest in an English grave or my clay mix with the earth of that country. I believe the thought would drive me mad on my death-bed' (p. 73),

ended by being interred in the parish church of Hacknal Torkard, an unromantic mining village.

It is of interest to learn that the liberally-minded Dean of Westminster, Herbert Ryle, even opposed the erection of a memorial tablet to Byron in the Abbey on the ground that 'Westminster Abbey primarily stands to witness for Jesus Christ.' Such a reason would hardly seem to justify Charles James Fox being buried there.

When, in the long winter evenings, the lover of the English countryside with its stately homes and ancient shrines is planning his summer, or better still, his autumn holiday, he will secure a foretaste of pleasure to come by reading the leisurely pages of Mr. Grant's book, *The Grey Shrines of England,* and will find himself murmuring not: What do they know of England who only England know? but how little do we who live in England really know much that is interesting and delightful in our native land. H.D.A.M.

ONE KIND OF RELIGION *

No one could guess from the title of Dr. Helen Wodehouse's book what its substance is about. Its general thesis however is made plain to the reader by the following lines of Matthew Arnold which are quoted with approval on the second page:

> 'Hath man no second life?—*Pitch this one high!* Sits there no judge in Heaven, our sin to see?—*More strictly, then, the inward judge obey!* Was Christ a man like us? *Ah! let us try if we then, too, can be such men as he!*'

The object of the writer is to construct a religion which will be independent of metaphysics. In this of itself there would, perhaps, be nothing very remarkable if Dr. Wodehouse were merely adding a fresh variation to the familiar theme of 'The religion of all sensible men.' But in point of fact her aim is more ambitious than this; it is to retain the traditional values of idealism whilst surrendering the metaphysics which they are customarily held to involve. In this way she tries to make it possible for us to walk by sight rather than by faith, lest faith in what is unseen and intangible should prove to be delusion after all.

It is evident that Dr. Wodehouse has become convinced that any form of Theism (as the word is commonly understood) is so improbable that it must be dismissed as irrelevant if not as positively untrue. But the conclusions to which this scepticism would naturally lead are not acceptable to her; hence the attempt before us to use the language of Theism in a fresh context where its truth or falsity has no relation to any reality which cannot be seen or handled.

> 'If I may use the name of God for that which I worship and that whose presence upholds me—for the sum and substance of all good—then I find that the great language of traditional religion is full of meaning for me, and that in prayer the sayings of the masters of prayer come true, even for a feeble disciple' (p. 3).

The point is, of course, whether the writer *is* justified in using the name of God and the great language of traditional religion. No doubt it is well

* *One Kind of Religion,* by Helen Wodehouse. (C.U.P. 8/6. 1944.)

that language should possess elasticity, but unless the words we use bear a fairly definite meaning our ideas can receive no precise expression and the result is bound to be confusion. Admittedly Dr. Wodehouse carefully defines her terms but her unfamiliar use of familiar phraseology seems to have blinded her to the divergence between her kind of religion and that from which her language is borrowed.

God, for her, is not a Being with Whom man may enter into personal relationship; neither does the word denote a system of impersonal laws; nor yet a totality of values which are self existent in their own right; God is the sum-total of empirical goodness to be found in the world — 'the concrete universal of good' is Dr. Wodehouse's definition. Whatever man feels to be good is an aspect of God.

> 'In so far as (man) really worships and is really upheld, he has found his way into some aspect of God — some goodness, even if it proves to be the gleam of light reflected from a tawdry jewel or an edge of broken glass, or the beautiful colour of a poison' (p. 5).

In view of this it seems almost incredible that the writer should attempt to shew any close agreement between herself and such convinced theists as Prof. C. C. J. Webb and Dr. H. H. Farmer. Yet such is the case. After quoting the following extract from Prof. Webb's *God and Personality*:

> 'While the affirmation of Personality *in* God has been a characteristic of Christian theological terminology since the third century of our era, the great majority of Christian theologians down to quite modern times have not affirmed in so many words the Personality *of* God.'

Dr. Wodehouse comments thus:

> 'It would appear that for the conception followed in the present work, the older use of language will be better. There will be personality in God as the symphony form is contained in music' (p. 44).

But Prof. Webb's statement bears no relation whatever to a pantheistic concept of deity in which personality has its place but only in finite persons who are themselves a literal part of deity. Between *P*ersonality in God and *p*ersonality in God there is a fundamental difference, but apparently Dr. Wodehouse fails to see the difference. Hence she does not appreciate the force of the Professor's further statement that—

> 'Nothing seems to possess beyond question the character which under the name of transcendence, Religion has been shewn to require in its object, the character of a reality fully equal to that of the subject, except what can claim to be, like the subject itself, *personal.' (God and Personality*, p. 206-7; quoted p. 49).

Her reply is that:

> 'In a *world* of persons (and of other-than-persons) there cannot be less reality than in the single finite person which (Prof. Webb) takes for "model and standard"' (p. 49). 'The reality of the object of religion is as important for me as for him,' she admits, 'and I hoped to secure it by starting from such conceptions as the sum of good' (p. 49).

Dr. Wodehouse also seeks to minimize the difference between her standpoint and that of Dr. H. H. Farmer. In chapter vii she gives several lengthy extracts from his book 'The World and God,' in which, like Prof. Webb, he emphasises the personal relations between God and man which are essential to theism. But to try and relate these to the doctrine that God only becomes personal in personal beings would seem to be a sheer waste of time.

Thus in one of these extracts, concerning the presence of absolute values in our moral experience, Dr. Farmer says that 'It is in and through the

accent of unconditionality that the awareness of meeting another's will in and through such values is given.' This awareness, he concludes, 'is the living awareness of the Eternal as personal.'

Dr. Wodehouse states that she can heartily accept this if she may interpret it in her own way. 'We know,' she says, 'deity in its aspect of "the ultimate Will haunting the soul" . . . It is "the living awareness of the Eternal as personal"—exactly' (p. 61). But in point of fact it would be hard to find two viewpoints more exactly opposite to each other than these. For Dr. Wodehouse, the Will which we are aware of is not another's, it is simply, as she says, 'a new mode' of our own will, and our experience is of one that is personal only because we are persons ourselves, since the deity shapes itself according to its environment. What she means by the 'Eternal' it is hard to say. Dr. Farmer's use of the word is, of course, perfectly straightforward; by it he signifies a personal God who endures through all eternity. But the element of empiricism which Dr. Wodehouse allows in her concept of God makes her use of this word peculiarly difficult. Nor is she herself unaware of the difficulty when later on she considers the position of a God who is organic to the material world and living things, if through increasing Entropy, the world itself must eventually be destroyed (Chapter xiii). This problem she finds so perplexing that at length she confesses 'We need another language to enable us to say what we mean' (p. 155).

Dr. Wodehouse finds a place for prayer in her system, though it is as unlike the prayer of the theist as her idea of God is unlike his idea of God. None the less she claims that by prayer we alter

> 'the world we live in and it swings us into a new place. God, the Substance of Good, can lift us by becoming the object of our love, and by living as love within us, and by flowing as grace towards us and through us from every source in our nature and in the world around. Theism teaches that God as Person is a further source of grace; the supreme mode of the object of love; a better friend than all those friends whose love upholds us. Yet I claim that the essence of dedication and worship, and the divine power that comes from these, can be present without that belief' (p. 74).

This is finely said. In answer to it we will quote some words of the late Dean Rashdall:

> 'I for one would not in any way throw ridicule or contempt upon the Agnostic's earnest attempt to supply the place which prayer should occupy in Christian lives by meditation and resolution, by some solemn dedication of his day to the highest that he knows. And if such impersonal prayers are answered, Christians will believe that the answer comes from God. But, in no spirit of contempt or superiority, it must be pointed out that such prayers cannot be all that Christians mean by prayer. In prayers the Christian believes himself to be standing in the immediate presence of a personal Will who knows him through and through, and who wills the highest good of all created beings. To will the good with all his might—this, happily, is open to the Agnostic or the sceptic. And God forbid that we should say that *that* can produce no good effect upon his character; but it cannot have exactly the same effect that flows from the habit of realizing to ourselves day by day the existence of a Will for the good, that works out His purposes independently of us, and yet effects those purposes of His partly through our co-operation.' *(Christus in Ecclesia,* pp. 149-150).

To my mind, these remarks of Dr. Rashdall suggest just what ought to be the Christian estimation of Dr. Wodehouse's book. That it is inspired by

high motives and contains much that is beautiful both in thought and expression, no fair minded reader will wish to deny. And for these reasons its pragmatic value may be considerable. But for all that it is unlikely that many will be attracted by it, for the driving force of religion is the purpose with which life is invested by it, and it is just this which is lacking from what Dr. Wodehouse offers us. She does indeed tell us that 'God is the meaning and the value of the universe; the point of the story' (p. 147). But this is only significant if, as she says, '"significance" be taken not as a reference away to something else, but as the opposite of insignificance.' But surely that is impossible. When we speak of the 'point of the story,' we mean that the story has been planned by some intelligent being who has given it the point wherein its meaning and significance lie. So too with the world itself. If it has a real meaning, a real point to its story, then there must be a mind behind it. If not, and yet we can still detect a purpose in it, such a purpose will only be accidental and therefore no true purpose at all. In that case, if we give the name of God to such a purpose, the object of our worship will be a mere contingency.

Dr. Wodehouse, I suppose, would deny this because for her, the concept of 'the concrete universal of good' is sufficiently real in itself. And unfortunately she does not apparently see why it cannot be so for others as well. To her, whatever is evident to the senses is real; and there is no room in her philosophy for a reality more ultimate than this, nor indeed does she feel the need of such. This is the fundamental reason why all that she has written must be profoundly unsatisfactory for those who hold that reality is a meaningless expression unless it denotes something which exists eternally of itself and is the ground of all else that exists; something moreover with which the evidence of our senses may not accord and which will therefore to that extent render their evidence unreal.

Nevertheless, if it must be admitted that Dr. Wodehouse has failed in her attempt to combine the language of metaphysics with the outlook of empiricism, it must also be admitted that she has failed nobly. One cannot but admire her courage and ingenuity when she expresses the hope (p. 144) that even the Logical Positivists (as they call themselves) might be able to regard the statement 'God exists' as corrigible and not nonsensical if they were to conceive of God as she herself conceives Him. (Incidentally this shews, even more than any other statement in the book, the extreme lengths to which her empiricism carries her.)

There is a misprint in the footnote on p. 106 where reference is made to Nehemiah iii, 34. The third chapter of Nehemiah contains only 32 verses, altogether.

D. L. Scott.

W. E. GLADSTONE AS AN ENGLISH CHURCHMAN*

As a young man, Gladstone was an ardent Tory, and was a no less ardent High Churchman. In this period of his life he produced a book, *The State in its relations to the Church*. Very few people alive to-day have read it. A larger circle know of its existence because of the criticism of it in one of the less notable of Macaulay's essays.

The Rev. Alec Vidler, Warden of St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, has sought, in a recent volume, *The Orb and the Cross*, to recover from oblivion Gladstone's views on the relations of Church and State. Mr. Vidler believes that they have not only a significance to-day but also a practical value which they had not when Gladstone expounded them and Macaulay criticised them. Gladstone's book passed into a fourth edition, and it is this fourth edition which Mr. Vidler uses as his text book.

* *The Orb and the Cross*, by Alec R. Vidler. (S.P.C.K. 12/6. 1945.)

The following sentences from Mr. Vidler's summary indicate the scope and significance of Gladstone's point of view.

> 'In dealing with the relations of Church and State, Gladstone rules out Hobbes on the one side who maintained that the Church is "a mere creature of the State," and on the other hand the theory of Bellarmine and the Ultramontanes who maintain that the temporal power in relation to the spiritual power is wholly dependent and subordinate' (p. 30).

Gladstone's view of the relations of Church and State also dissented from those of Bishop Warburton and Archdeacon Paley but was closely akin to those of Edmund Burke and S. T. Coleridge. Gladstone agreed with Hooker's conviction that the State 'is bound by all constitutional and natural means to advance true religion.' Mr. Vidler institutes an interesting comparison between Gladstone's view and that of F. D. Maurice. He writes:

> 'Both founded their teaching in theology; both taught that the State has a conscience, and maintained a high doctrine of its duty to the Church. But whereas, as we shall see, Gladstone held that the State is capable of taking cognisance of, and has a duty to acknowledge, theological truth, Maurice denied this and based the State's duty to recognize the Church and "give it free scope to educate the people" on the State's incapacity to do so, though it can see that for its own well-being the people must be educated. Maurice's theory was, as he himself owned, little more than a working out of Coleridge's, and his method was primarily historical, where Gladstone's was primarily analytical' (p. 31).

But whatever Gladstone's theories as to the relations of Church and State, the successive political situations with which he was confronted as a statesman precluded his permitting them to constitute a factor in his political policy. He lived a life of a devoted member of the Church of England. He was loyal to her doctrine and loved her cultus. As a Prime Minister he showed extreme conscientiousness and great gifts of insight in his selection of clergymen for preferment by the Crown. But beyond this his service to the national church was not able to advance. D. C. Somervell, cited by Mr. Vidler, says 'The worst of the argument of *The State in its relations with the Church* was that no practical politician of the Victorian age now opening could possibly accept it,' but Gladstone as a politician was pre-eminently practical and realist.

When Gladstone was a young man he had contemplated becoming a clergyman, but was dissuaded by his father. Mr. Vidler intrigues his readers by speculating as to what would have been the character and condition of the Church of England to-day had Gladstone become Archbishop of Canterbury. He cites an arresting passage from a letter written by Gladstone to Manning when Gladstone had definitely decided on a political career.

> 'In my own case there is work ready to my hand and much more than enough for its weakness, a great mercy and comfort. But I think I know what my course would be, were there not. It would be to set to work upon the holy task of clearing, opening, and establishing positive truth in the Church of England, which is an office doubly blessed, inasmuch as it is both the business of truth, and the laying of firm foundations for future union in Christendom.'

He might well have become our first modernist Archbishop of Canterbury.

Mr. Vidler's book is the fruit of much research, wide sympathy, and judicious thinking. It deals with the subject which is of much greater importance for the welfare of our nation than many realise. We commend it heartily to the attention of our readers. H.D.A.M.

PAPAL HUMANISM AND CATHOLIC DEMOCRACY

The Rights of Man. by Jacques Maritain. Bles. 3/6, 1944.
Christianity and Democracy by Jacques Maritain. Bles 5/-, 1945.

In a recent broadcast Mr. A. J. P. Taylor noted a remarkable change in the political policy of the Roman Catholic Church. The Roman Church, which was lately favouring dictatorships of the right, Dollfuss and Schuschnigg in Austria, Franco in Spain, and Salazar in Portugal, is now taking a democratic and even revolutionary line. The new Agrarian or Christian Democratic parties in countries like Poland, Italy and France are supported by Roman Catholic voters, but they favour democratic principles. They are ceasing to demand a privileged position for the Roman Church. They defend toleration for everybody; they are making their peace with the principles of liberty and the Rights of Man.

The political philosophy of these parties has been sketched by the Roman Catholic writer, M. Jacques Maritain, in two most persuasive and sympathetic little books, *The Rights of Man,* and *Christian Democracy*. He calls his philosophy 'a *humanist* political philosophy, or a political humanism.' (*Rights of Man,* p. 29). How unwise the authors of *The Conversion of England* were to make a frontal attack on humanism! M. Maritain's starting point is the essential worth and dignity of man.

> 'An essential characteristic of any civilization worthy of the name is respect and feeling for the dignity of the human person' (p. 5).

This is so because through his personality 'man is an individual who holds himself in by his intelligence and by his will' (p. 6). Human personality has worth and dignity because man is made in God's image.

> 'The worth of the person, his liberty, his rights, arise from the order of naturally sacred things, which bear upon them the imprint of the Father of Being, and which have in Him the goal of their movement. A person possesses absolute dignity because he is in direct relationship with the absolute, in which alone he can find his complete fulfillment' (p. 6).
>
> 'I am not forgetting that strangers to Christian philosophy can have a profound and authentic feeling for the human person and his dignity, and even at times show by their behaviour a practical respect for that dignity which few can equal. But the description of the person here outlined is, I believe, the only one, which without their being aware of it, provides a complete rational justification for their practical convictions' (p. 7).

M. Maritain then proceeds to show that man is a social being, that he needs the companionship of his fellowmen.

> 'The person is a whole, but it is not a closed whole, it is an open whole . . . It tends by its very nature to social life and to communion' (p. 7).
>
> 'This is true not only because of the needs and the indigence of human nature, by reason of which each one of us has need of others for his material, intellectual and moral life, but also because of the radical generosity inscribed within the very being of the person, because of that openness to the communications of intelligence and love which is the nature of the spirit, and which demands an entrance into relationship with other persons' (p. 7).

Through his nature man needs to be a member of society, particularly of political society. But there is always tension between himself and the political society of which he is a member. He is a part of a whole, and the

whole is greater than the part. The good of the society is different from the good of the individuals which compose it. But the good of society must be essentially *human,* and becomes perverted if it does not contribute to the development and improvement of human persons. Man is also a member of other societies besides political society, for instance, the family. And lastly, because he is an immortal soul, he transcends all human societies, and enjoys a direct relationship with God. Thus a society of free men has the four following characteristics:

> 'It is *personalist,* because society is a whole composed of persons, whose dignity is anterior to society and who however indigent they may be, contain within their very being a root of independence, and aspire to ever greater degrees of independence, until they achieve that perfect spiritual liberty which no human society has within its gift.
>
> 'It is *communal,* because the person tends naturally towards society and communion, in particular towards the political community . . whose common good is superior to that of individuals.
>
> 'It is *pluralist,* because the development of the human person normally requires a plurality of autonomous communities which have their rights, liberties and authority; some are of a rank inferior to the political state; others are of a rank superior, as is above all the Church in the minds of Christians.
>
> 'Finally . . . it is *theist* or Christian, not in the sense that it would require every member of it to believe in God and be a Christian, but in the sense that it recognized that in the reality of things, God, principle and end of the human person and prime source of natural law, is by the same token the prime source of political society and authority among men; and in the sense that it recognises that the currents of liberty and fraternity released by the Gospel, the virtues of justice and friendship sanctioned by it, the practical respect for the human person proclaimed by it, the feeling of responsibility before God required by it, are the internal energy which civilization needs to achieve its fulfillment. As for those who do not believe in God or who do not profess Christianity, if they do, however, believe in the dignity of the human person, in justice, in liberty, in neighbourly love, they also can co-operate in the realization of such a society, even though they cannot trace their practical convictions to basic principles' (p. 15).

In order to do its work, the Church must decline all material advantages and privileges which the political state can give.

> 'Every attempt at a clerical or decoratively Christian state . . . imposing on the community by means of a system of privileges and by the supremacy of the means of constraint, certain external forms or Christian appearances destined above all to strengthen power and the existing order — every attempt at a pharisaically Christian state is sure in the world today to become the victim of anti-Christian totalitarianism' (p. 16).
>
> 'It is the spiritual mission of the Church which must be helped, not the political power or the temporal advantages to which certain of its members might lay claim in its name. And in the stage of development and self-awareness which modern societies have reached, a social or political discrimination in favour of the Church, or the granting of temporal privileges to its ministers or to its faithful, or any policy of clericalism, would be precisely of a nature to compromise rather than to help this spiritual mission' (p. 18).

M. Maritain has an interesting section on human progress, an idea which he maintains is of Christian origin, and is the 'historic vocation of mankind.'

'If we take as our perspective the entire history of life and humanity . . . we recover faith in the forward march of our species and we understand that the law of life which leads to greater unity by means of greater organization, passes normally from the sphere of biological progress to that of social progress and the evolution of the civilized community (p. 20).

'Indeed, whether it has remained Christian or become secularized, this idea of the historic vocation of mankind is of Christian origin and derives from Christian inspiration; the surprising thing is that many Christians have lost sight of this idea, and, while remaining attached to the dogmas of faith, put aside the inspiration of faith when judging of human things' (p. 22).

The quotations given so far have all been taken from *The Rights of Man*, a book published in 1944, but written two or three years earlier, before the defeat of Germany was certain. The preface to the second of M. Maritain's books under review here is dated October 1943, when German defeat was already certain. In this second volume *Christianity and Democracy* dedicated to the people of France, M. Maritain outlines the sort of political programme which would be the practical application of the theory he has sketched in *The Rights of Man*. Here is his inspiring conclusion:—

'It is the task of a supreme effort of human freedom, in the mortal struggle in which it is engaged today, to ensure that the age which we are entering is not the age of the masses and of the shapeless multitudes nourished, brought into subjection and led to the slaughter by infamous demi-gods, but rather the age of the people, and of the man of common humanity . . . cognizant of the dignity of the human person in himself, builder of a more human world directed towards an historical ideal of human brotherhood . . . We do not believe that Paradise will be achieved to-morrow; but the task to which we are summoned, the task we have to pursue with all the more courage and hope because at each moment it will be betrayed by human weakness, this task must have for its objective a world of free men imbued in its secular substance by a genuine and living Christianity, a world in which the inspiration of the Gospel will orientate common life toward an heroic humanism.' *(Christianity and Democracy p. 64).*

J. K. NETTLEFOLD.

DEAN SELWYN ON I. PETER *

A notable contribution to New Testament scholarship has been made by Dean Selwyn in his Commentary on the *First Epistle of St. Peter*. It is worthy to rank with Dean Armitage Robinson's Commentary on *Ephesians*, J. B. Mayor on *St. James*, Westcott's *Epistles of St. John* and Lightfoot's *Pauline Epistles*: it embodies, not only the fruits of spacious classical, patristic, and liturgical erudition but also exhibits a fine appreciation of the methods, speculations and contributions of modern New Testament research. Among our English New Testament scholars serious regard is paid to the work of Rendel Harris, Streeter and Moffatt. The Synoptic Gospels, Acts, Pauline Epistles and Johannine writings have received such a wealth of criticism and exposition during the last half century that it is peculiarly refreshing to study a book of the New Testament which is in another class. Somehow, both among English New Testament scholars and ordinary English Church people, St. Peter has received less than his due. He has been overshadowed by our favourite apostles St. Paul and St. John—the great apostles of the Reformation as depicted by Albrecht Dürer. Yet there

* *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, by E. G. Selwyn, D.D. (Macmillans. 25/-. 1946.)

is something singularly attractive about St. Peter. He may be less majestic than St. Paul and St. John but he is more lovable and human and is possessed of a gift of utterly sincere humility and a power of penitence which entitles him to a very high place among the apostolic saints. The Church of Rome in doing him more than justice has done him less than justice. It was St. Peter's humility of spirit which was the true basis of Christian unity and there is little doubt that it was his self-effacing statesmanship which held together Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity during a period of intense strain.

Although Dean Selwyn investigates and weighs the pros and cons of many critical theories, his conclusions, in so far as he presents them as conclusions, do not preclude our holding to the generally accepted view of the authorship, purpose, destination and date of the *First Epistle of St. Peter*.

The Epistle emanated from St. Peter although he did not actually write it. It is written in sound Hellenistic Greek (*koiné* is the usual term for it) but St. Peter was an Aramaic-speaking man who, according to a widespread primitive tradition, made use of Mark as his interpreter when recounting to the Roman Christians his reminiscenses of Jesus. In composing his epistle St. Peter made use of Silvanus (Silas), a fellow-missionary of St. Paul and like St. Paul, a Roman citizen. Silvanus had co-operated with St. Paul in writing the first and second Epistles to the *Thessalonians* and St. Peter made use of Silvanus, so he tells us, to write his epistle for him (*I Peter* v, 12). Dr. Selwyn makes valuable use of the phraseology of *Thessalonians* in elucidating passages in I. *Peter*.

Silvanus was probably much better known to the Christians in Asia Minor, to whom the Epistle is addressed, than was Mark—although that Mark was known, at least to some of them, is shewn by St. Peter including him in the personal salutation.

The Epistle was written from Rome. Dr. Selwyn interprets Babylon in that sense, as do all Christian exegetes down to the time of the Reformation. Dr. Selwyn seems to favour an early date for the Epistle mainly on account of the simple, primitive, undeveloped type of Christian doctrine and organization which it enshrines. It was certainly written during a period when Christians were being legally persecuted by the pagan authorities. Since Christian tradition assigns the date of St. Peter's martyrdom at Rome to the reign of Nero, there is much to be said for the epistle having been written in the later part of Nero's reign. It is usually assumed that because the Epistle was written to prepare the Asiatic Christians for the fiery trial which was to befall them, as it had befallen their fellow-Christians in Rome, that therefore they were subjected to persecution. There is no convincing evidence of the imperial persecution of Christians in Asia before the reign of Domitian and perhaps not even before the reign of Trajan. There is no evidence that Nero's persecution ever spread to Asia, although St. Peter anticipated that it would and warned the Asiatic Christians to prepare for it. To be forewarned and so forearmed does not necessitate a subsequent conflict. The younger Pliny's letter to Trajan certainly suggests that he was faced as a Roman governor with a new situation in Asia, and wished to know how as an imperial official he ought to act towards the Christians.

So hortatory is the tone of the Epistle that some modern exegetes have been inclined to regard it as a catechetical discourse—a sermon, or a course of sermons, presented in an epistolary form. It may be so. What used to be described as the *Second Epistle of Clement of Rome* is now recognized to be a primitive Christian sermon—possibly the earliest Christian sermon we have outside the New Testament.

Dr. Selwyn gives considerable attention to the Descent into Hades and the Harrowing of Hell as primitive Christian doctrines closely connected with *I Peter*. It is curious how this doctrine (for the second is only a development of the first) has come to be connected so intimately with St. Peter, not only in canonical books of the New Testament but also in Apocryphal New Testament writings. It is curious also how it is preserved in the Baptismal creed of the Roman Church. Rufinus, who wrote our earliest commentary on the Apostles' Creed, asserts that the clause 'He descended into Hell (*Hades*)' did not occur in the creed as used in his church of Aquileia but that it had its place in the Roman version of the creed.

Dr. Selwyn discards as 'most improbable' Rendel Harris's brilliant emendation of I. *Peter* ii, 13, by which Enoch, not Jesus Christ, preached to the spirits in prison. (p. 198.)

There is a vast body of valuable and suggestive material in this commentary for it combines tradition with modernity in a very remarkable manner and we can think of no better book to be used by the clergy in their societies of sacred study at the present time, particularly if they would supplement Selwyn's Commentary by the devotional Commentary of the saintly Archbishop Leighton. H.D.A.M.

HOW TO TEACH CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE *

The Teaching of Christian Doctrine in Schools and Colleges by G. A. Richards, B.Sc., is, as its title indicates, intended for teachers. It is sincere and practical and open-minded but it will not satisfy either the traditionalist or the Modernist. In some respects it is definitely modernist when for instance the author objects strongly to the teaching of the Two Natures in Christ, asserting that

> 'The doctrine of the "Two Natures" of Christ seems unnecessary and mischievous in that it destroys the "person" . . . . From the Bible, particularly from the New Testament, we are sure of the following fact: That there was complete wholeness, complete unity, in the Person and Nature of Christ, "there was one consciousness and one will." To doubt this defies all the findings of modern psychology regarding the nature of personality.'

The author pleads for a 'reverent agnosticism' in replying to various problems of Christian doctrine. Teachers are left free to teach or not to teach the Virgin Birth and to answer 'we do not know' what became of the physical body of Jesus at the Resurrection. The writer pleads for accepting the *fact* of a miracle though unable to provide any adequate explanation of its *method*. No reference is made to the bearing of the study of Comparative Religion on these points.

The strongest feature in the book is its practical character. The two following pieces of advice to the teacher of the Christian Religion to the young cannot be stressed too often.

> 'It is most important that children should be taught nothing at school which they have to unlearn in after-life. Many people have lost their belief in God, and others have had years of unnecessary suffering, because clergy and teachers have not thought out carefully enough what they are teaching about Christianity.'
>
> 'The aim of Religious Education should be to make Christians, to bring children into touch with God through Christ. In attempting this, all the teaching must be related to the child's immediate life and should be relevant to his experience, so that he feels the need to consult God

* *The Teaching of Christian Doctrine in Schools and Colleges*, by G. A. Richards, B.Sc. (Religious Education Press. 4/-. 1946.)

about his own problems and, by so doing, gains knowledge of God's ability to direct his life and of His *power* to help him in all that he does from day to day. In fact the child must be led to *Christian experience*, which is possible for all, even young children.

Teachers are sometimes disappointed with what they can achieve in school, but if they have taught children to pray and to feel the necessity to keep in touch with God, they have probably accomplished the one essential thing which is the basis of the Christian life.'

H.D.A.M.

ARCHITECTURAL PLANS AND PROJECTS *

Never in the history of this country has the interest in architecture and town planning been so widespread and acute as it is to-day. In a delightfully illustrated volume, Mr. Lawrence Dale has given us a book which all who are interested in Oxford and not least in its unparalleled charm, will find it impossible to lay down when they have once opened it.

His main proposal is to construct a semi-circular boulevard running from the Iffley Road across the Cherwell, skirting Christ Church Meadow, then crossing St. Aldate's close to Folly Bridge and continuing in a new curve through a less picturesque quarter of the City, emerging at the railway stations. Certainly this new thoroughfare would divert much traffic from Carfax but many would reject it because of its menace to the quiet beauty of Christ Church Meadow. Mr. Dale is well aware of this danger and seeks to eliminate it by an attractively designed boulevard (the Mall) raised some feet above the level of the Meadow. To realise the force of the argument for Mr. Dale's proposal, its details and plans presented in his book ought to be carefully studied. Plainly something needs doing.

Those who are thinking of building new houses, and what a multitude they are to-day, would secure much enlightenment and enjoyment by reading *A Miniature History of the English House* with its numerous illustrations — at least a hundred — dating from 700 A.D. to the present day. The illustrations are for the most part façades, but there are some interiors and a number of interesting groundplans.

> 'In the notes that form the text of this book a definite attempt has been made, while still giving the essential information about the characteristic details of each period, to explain the evolution of the English house not as a series of unaccountable changes in design, but as a series of effects traceable to comprehensible human causes, whether of the nature of changes in habits of living, in fashions of taste, in available materials or in building technique.'

A veritable *magnum in parvo*.

Another book of quite unusual interest and practical value dealing with modern architectural design is *Community Centres* by Air Vice-Marshal Thorold and D. G. Farrow with a Preface by Arthur Bryant. It possesses a number of interesting illustrations of the interiors of these new community centres. The book, of course, is social rather than architectural in its scope, but for those rural reformers who look forward to providing social centres and contemplate erecting new buildings for this purpose in their villages there is much to be learnt from the practical contribution made by Air Vice-Marshal Thorold. Of course, the architectural aspect of the venture of

* *Towards a Plan for Oxford City*, by Lawrence Dale. (Faber and Faber. 6/-. 1945.)
A Miniature History of the English House, by J. M. Richards. (The Architectural Press. Third Impression. 4/6. 1942.)
Community Centres. Some Service Experiences by Air Vice-Marshal H. K. Thorold and D. G. Farrow. (Van Thal Ltd. 6/-. 1946.)

faith described in this book was entirely subordinate to its social and educational aims. These are described as follows by Mr. Arthur Bryant.

> 'The object of this kind of education was first to attract: then to direct the mind to useful study. The News Room or Community Centre was first a club, then a society for mutual discovery. Drawn imperceptibly by its good cheer and pleasant atmosphere, the airman began almost unconsciously to discover a new world both inside himself and outside himself — the world of the mind and the imagination, and the world of organized society. It is against that background, created by men like themselves, that I shall always think of the two officers who have collaborated to write this book; and I shall remember, too, some of my own happiest hours of the war, spent in the society of those whose vision of the future for which they were fighting was so clear and bright that it cast, as it were, a beam of light through the dark clouds ahead.'

H.D.A.M.

IN PRAISE OF ARCHDEACONS*

In the mediaeval church the question was often asked in a spirit of irony and irritation: 'Can an Archdeacon be saved?' It was a rhetorical question: one which supplied its own answer, for the question in the Latin tongue opened with the word *Num,* and questions which begin with that word demand the answer 'No.' Perhaps charitably minded people added the comment which Our Lord uttered in His teaching about the salvation of rich men. 'With men this is impossible, but not with God for with God all things are possible.' Why was this view held? It is important to know. We once heard the late Dr. A. J. Carlyle, no mean historian, assert in the pulpit that if we all knew very much more history than we do, not only would many things which exist to-day and are inexplicable, become clear to us but that our own attitude towards them would also become much more tolerant. He cited the prejudice against Archdeacons as an example of this. The Archdeacon was named *oculus episcopi,* the eye of the bishop. That eye, in the case of the Archdeacon was a disciplinary eye. It was quick to mark what was done amiss and it was the duty of the observer to inform his bishop. Hence the Archdeacon was both a spy and a clerical talebearer, but that official's 'archidiaconal functions' were rendered even more invidious by including a great deal of financial administration, and in the Middle Ages, at any rate, good men, and many who were not good, despised those who were engaged in finance which was closely associated in their minds with the vices of extortion, dishonesty, and worldliness. It is amazing under the circumstances that good clergymen could be found willing to occupy such a post, but it must be remembered that though Archdeacons were disliked and distrusted by the clergy, they were the right hand men of the bishop, and enjoyed a considerable reputation for mental acumen and practical ability. In brief, they were, like dilapidations, necessary evils of the ecclesiastical institution.

Dr. Alington, the Dean of Durham, is well aware of all this, and has most ingeniously undertaken to produce a defence of Archdeacons, indeed a eulogy of them, in the disguise of a modern detective story. In his charming leisure-hour volume, *Archdeacons Afloat,* which he must have found great fun to write, he relates a thrilling adventure in which two Archdeacons, differing widely in temperament from each other, are the heroes of an Hellenic cruise. Both are fine specimens of English clergymen, conscientious, courteous, judicious, reasonable, and not afraid to do their duty in times of crisis. Dr. Alington, it is only natural, could not forbear to make

**Archdeacons Afloat,* by C. A. Alington. (Faber and Faber. 7/6. 1946.)

at least one of them an Etonian. We must not write more. They can only be really appreciated by those who seek their society. May the race of Archdeacons of this species be multiplied.

H.D.A.M.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

THE RESURRECTION—MATERIALIZATION OR DE-MATERIALIZATION?

Sir,

In reply to your suggestion that the appearance of Jesus to Mary in the Garden, may have been a *De*-materialization, rather than a Materialization, we would ask Why should we go out of our way to suppose De-materialization—and Miracle, when the facts as recorded by the Evangelists amply justify belief in a normal Materialization in accordance with examples with which psychic students are familiar to-day?

All four Evangelists affirm that Jesus died on the Cross, 'gave up the ghost' as it is phrased. This means of course that the spirit, the soul-body of Jesus, left His physical body while He was on the Cross—at Death, as all spirits leave physical bodies at Death. This soul-body or spirit, was thenceforth free to materialize if and when suitable conditions were provided—as they were—by a mediumistic person such as Mary—and subsequently by the Disciples. What happened to the physical body of Jesus after the soul-body was removed, is then unimportant. Jesus would be no more concerned with it, than with a disused overcoat. The fate of His earthly body is only of polemical interest.

For students of psychic science who realize the danger to a medium of contacting a newly materialized form, Jesus' warning to Mary TOUCH ME NOT, when in her eagerness she stretched out her hands to welcome her beloved Master, is delightfully evidential of a normal materialization on normal lines. And we feel strongly that every time we can substitute for a miraculous interpretation of the Christian story, an interpretation in conformity with known laws we are removing one of the obstacles which block belief in the Churches' Teaching of Christianity. And abandonment of belief in Christianity involves, as we see in the world to-day, abandonment of the Ethics which have been the distinguishing feature of Christianity, and abandonment of the Civilization which has been founded upon Christian Ethics. The question therefore of Materialization or De-Materialization may have a greater significance than might be at first sight supposed?

Dene Cliff, 31 Sandbourne Road,
Bournemouth West, Hants.

M. A. St. Clair Stobart.

FOOD AND THE FALL

Sir,

Thank you very much for your delightful notice 'Food and the Fall' calling your readers' attention to my paper 'Man into Wolf' in the *Hibbert Journal*. May I point out that my anthropological account of the Fall does *not* describe the Fall as 'due largely to a change in the diet of primitive man'? The transition—under the pressure of the change in environment from the pluvial age to the desiccation which transformed the primeval forest into park-landscape and steppe—of a section of the fruit-, seed- and root-eating 'taurodont' herds of peaceful innocuous simian *primates* and pygmy wood-dwellers to the carnivorous, indeed cannibal habits of the early 'cynodont,' lupine pack of man, 'the most dangerous predatory animal' *is* the

Fall. The breakaway from the 'in-nocent' ancestral behaviour-pattern, the *mores* of the herd, *is* the original 'im-moral' act, the upheaval accompanied by the feeling of guilt and sinfulness on the part of those who 'ape' the lupine behaviour of the wolf-pack and become 'werewolves' or 'wolf-men' by donning the 'coats of skin' of killed and eaten animals, under which the hairy hominid * grew naked and reluctant to discard his garment.

As to man's dentition, I quoted the lamented J. R. de la Haye Marett who has shown that a change from the 'taurodont' molars to Neanderthal man, adapted to the chewing of hard seeds and tough roots to the 'cynodont' denture of recent man can be explained as caused by a change in diet reducing the intake of vitamin C, that is by the transition to essentially carnivorous habits.

Human intestines have the same relative length as those of the simian *primates* who are fruit-eaters as the once 'missing-link' between ape and man must have been and as modern vegetarians are. The length of these intestines is, as you say, midway between that of carnivorous and graminivorous animals. But this is so because they are fruit-eaters' intestines, not because they are adapted to a mixed diet, unknown to all the apes. No primate can live on grass and straw like the graminivorous and the ruminating herds of the steppe and prairie. This forced the *primates* driven from the woods to the new grassland to attack the grass-eating animals and to become beasts of prey, nay cannibals as *Sinanthropus Pekinensis* is found to have been. This is meant in *Gen.* VI 12f. by the 'corruption of the way of all flesh' and the 'filling of the earth with violence.' The assumption is that before the Fall of Man all animals were peaceful and there were no predatory beings at all.

The Sumerian tablet of about 2,000 B.C. found in Nippur published by Samuel N. Kramer, *Journ. Americ. Orient. Soc.* LXIII 1934 p. 191 says: 'In those days there was no adder, . . no scorpion . . no hyaena . . no lion . . no jackal, no wolf . . . there was no fear . . . man had no rival . . . ' and the roughly contemporary silver-vase of Maikop showing the 'rivers of Paradise' running down from the heights of the Caucasus represents the (now) wild beasts and the tame animals peacefully grazing together and the bear—like the Daunian she-bear of Pythagoras—eating the fruit of the palm-tree.

Your readers will be interested to hear that *Gen.* vi, 4, 'there were giants in the earth in those days,' is now confirmed beyond doubt as a genuine pre-historic oral tradition by the discoveries of Dr. R. von Koenigswald who found in 1937 in the Trinil beds of Sangiron (Java) a large fragment of a lower jaw, more complete than the one picked up in 1891 by Dubois in the Trinil gravel beds of Kedung Brubus and attributed to his '*Pithecanthropus.*' In 1938 Königswald found a skull-cap fragment more complete than Dubois' 'ape-man' skull—morphologically not the skull of a giant gibbon, but of a true hominid much like *Pithecanthropus Pekinensis* of the Chu-Cu-Tien cave. In 1939 the site where the skull-cap was found yielded an upper jaw larger than any known fossil or recent human jaw with a canine tooth not tusk-like but with all the peculiarities of the truly human canines of *Sinanthropus.* In the same place the calvaria and a fragment of a lower jaw still larger than the 1937 find were recovered. The year 1941 yielded a fragment of the lower jaw, the most primitive human skeleton part ever found which exceeds in size every known fossil or recent jaw, including the one of *homo Heidelbergensis.* The teeth participate in this astonishing gigantism of the species now called *Meganthropus Palaeo-Javanicus,* while the 1937 find has been labelled *Pithecanthropus robustus.* In South China,

* There is a Greek popular tradition (*Zeitschr. f. neutest. Wiss.* XXVII, 1928, p. 308) that Adam and Eve were shaggy like bears.

between 1939 and 1944, three right-side lower molars of gigantic size were acquired, not belonging to some giant fossil ape, but to a true hominid now called *Giganthropus Sinensis*. They are six times larger than the teeth of modern man and twice the size of gorilla molars. These teeth come from the caves in the yellow deposit South of the Yang-Tse and belong to the Lower and Middle Pleistocene where tapir, stegodon and Orang Utan remains are also encountered. You find photographic illustrations in Vol. XV (1945) of the *Anthropological Papers of the American Natural History Museum, N.Y.* (See Franz Weidenreich, *Science*, vol. 99, June 16th, 1944, Lancaster Pa., Nr. 2581, pp. 479-480).

Gen. ix, 3 — which I did not quote — permits animal food, already presupposed at the time of Abel's sacrifice (*Gen.* iv, 3), as a concession to fallen man's ineradicable cravings. Obviously the suppression of hunting and of slaughtering herded animals would condemn a part of the population vastly increased through the dietary change to starvation which would be contrary to the precept of *Gen.* ix, 7 to breed and multiply to the limit of the available food supply and its possible increase.

I have no doubt that the passage is directed against those numerous reformers who advocated and still advocate a return to primitive vegetarianism. *Gen.* ix, 7 forbids only cannibalism and werewolves' vampyrism.

The connection between the rise of imperialism and the rule of the Near Eastern kings—regularly represented as 'mighty hunters'—established in the verse *Gen.* x, 8 about Lugal Maradda, the 'king of Marad,' or Nin-Maradda, the 'Lord of Marad,' the Biblical *Ni(n)merod* will be treated in a separate paper on war as originally a man-hunt.

A complete confirmation of my interpretation of what happened in *gan den — edinnu* is the Sumero-Babylonian word for the steppe and the desert, *gan* is 'garden,' Greek *paradeisos*, Iranian *payria daesa* is a park, especially a deer park—is offered by the Sumerian story (2000 B.C.) of the Fall found in Nippur and published by the late A. Chiera in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, Vol. XXXIX (1922), p. 40*ff*. Here the broken tablet begins with the culprit having used something 'as if it were vegetable food'—obviously one of the animals of the gods he had been shepherding and will henceforth no more be allowed to tend. 'To do that, with malice he has' . . . . He confesses: 'I have not been obedient to thee' . . . 'my heart is full of fear' . . . 'tears, weeping has been shed' . . . 'At the sending of thy call' . . . 'I, at thy call, from my appearance was fleeing' . . . —a line explained by the Persian tradition (*Bundahishn* iii, 20) that the first man Gayo-mard sees his own image reflected in the water. He is told: 'Thy humanity, thy body has not been set free' (for thee to look at). 'For humanity the words of understanding' (*videl.* the mysteries of life) 'are not.' 'Finish thy weeping.' 'From my place go into the desert.' 'To me, for ever more, for taking the tree that establisheth clothing' (*cp.* the aprons of fig-leaves' of the primitive leaf-wearing races) 'as an outcast thou shalt not return.' 'The reed which frees from death' (*i.e.* the medicinally used sugar-cane), 'the small ones of the small' . . . 'shall not take.' (So the men cut off from the plant of immortality, from Ignatius' *pharmakon athanasias* are pygmies !) 'Thou never shalt take' . . . 'in no way whatever thou shalt reach release' (from death). 'To my ox for leading it, as an outcast thou shalt not return, to my garden thou shalt not return. Go, till thy place of sojourn, raise the food for eating.'

What could be more illuminating?

ROBERT EISLER.

The Dower House,
The Dower House, Mangersbury,
nr. Stow-on-the-Wold, Gloucestershire.